DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 557 FL 001 932

AUTHOR	Allen, Virginia Garibaldi, Comp.; Paquette, F. Andre, Ed.
TITLE	New Dimensions in the Teaching of FLES: The Student's World Is the World.
INSTITUTICN	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York, N.Y.; Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Indiana Language Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	59p.
AVAILABLE FROM	MLA/ACTFL Materials Center, 62 Fifth Ave., New Ycrk, N.Y. ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, Curriculum Development, Curriculum Problems, Educational Administration, *Educational Change, Educational Psychology, Educational Trends, Elementary Education, Elementary Schools, *Fles, *Language Instruction, Language Patterns, Language Programs, *Modern Languages, Psycholinguistics, School Supervision, Second Language Learning

ABSTRACT

Five position papers resulting from a conference on the teaching of FLES discuss recent theory about elementary education and are intended to initiate a dialogue among teachers of foreign languages directed toward the exploration of ways and means of managing educational change. The report suggests how a broader rationale and a new curriculum base for FLES might be evolved. Papers include: (1) "Psychological and Educational Considerations in Early Language Learning", (2) "The Emerging Elementary School as a Setting for Foreign Language Instruction", (3) "Trends in Two Elementary School Subject-Matter Areas", (4) "Goals and Trends of Administration, Organization, and Supervision in Elementary Education", and (5) "Managing Change". The appendix contains background notes on the conference, the conference program, and a list of participants. (RL)

ED047557

The Student's World is the World

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Compiled by
Virginia Garibaldi Allen

Edited by
F. André Paquette

New Dimensions in the Teaching of FLES

A report designed to extend the dialogue begun in the
National Invitational Work Conference
Co-sponsored by the
Indiana Language Program and the
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
8-9 November 1968, Minneapolis, Minnesota

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ACTFL
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

The Indiana Language Program
101 Lindley Hall
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

FL001932

Contents

	Preface	5
	Introduction	7
1	Psychological and Educational Considerations in Early Language Learning	9
2	The Emerging Elementary School as a Setting for Foreign-Language Instruction	19
3	Trends in Two Elementary School Subject-Matter Areas	31
4	Goals and Trends of Administration, Organization, and Supervision in Elementary Education	41
5	Managing Change	57
	Appendix	60

Published by **ACTFL** in cooperation with
the **Indiana Language Program,**
Indiana University

Copyright © 1969 by the
**American Council on the
Teaching of Foreign Languages**

Copies of this publication are available
from the:
Materials Center
ACTFL
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011

Preface

"You were invited to this conference for two reasons: to explore many new ideas about American elementary education and to initiate a dialogue between teachers of foreign languages in the elementary school (FLES) and others interested in the education of young Americans."

With these words Emma Birkmaier, 1968 President of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), captured the spirit of three years of planning by the Indiana Language Program (ILP) and set the tone for an effort to develop a broader rationale and new curriculum base for FLES. The first big step in this profession-wide effort had been taken; the ILP-ACTFL Invitational Conference—"New Dimensions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School"—had opened the dialogue.

What follows is not a set of "proceedings"; it is a carefully edited report designed to extend a dialogue. You are invited to approach this report with the same deliberation that led to the conference and the frame of mind that shaped and dominated the conference and the preparation of this report; in short, you are invited to explore these pages and to talk about the ideas they contain with your fellow elementary school educators. But two words of caution: if you would explore freely, you must have an open mind; if you would engage in a true dialogue, you must spend some time listening.

F. André Paquette
Executive Secretary, ACTFL

Introduction

The whole of society today is absorbed with and in change. Like all educators, foreign-language teachers are conscious of the changes taking place outside the school and outside the classroom, but societal change has not been a topic for discussion in foreign-language meetings; program topics are more often related to the structure of language, teaching methods, the teaching of literature, or the long language sequence than to societal upheaval, the total curriculum, the student as an individual, or the changes taking place in other subject-matter areas. We have been discussing foreign language as a self-contained entity, paying little attention to the meaning that an environment of change *must* have for all educators.

The news media make it painfully clear that societal change cannot be divorced from the classroom. In the student's world, the key word is "mass"—mass production, mass transit, mass education, mass communication—and the "mass" movements continue to accelerate and proliferate. The student's society, then, is becoming less and less diverse on a national level, for mass movements are movements toward standardization; but the student, through the mass media and the myriad of resources open to him, explores and experiences an infinite variety of "worlds." In this regard the student is Time's most fortunate man—he has few temporal or spatial limitations.

Today's student, soon to be the student of the seventies, does have severe limitations of a nature never before known with such intensity; he does experience more worlds than any previous generation did or could, but the criteria for judgment he has been taught are proving ineffective for him. Each time he enters one of these "new" worlds, he is presented with choices and decisions to make, and each time he tries to apply the criteria he has been taught he is frustrated. Not only are the "old" standards and norms of little use to him, but also no one is helping him to evolve new norms and standards that will serve. The student of the seventies is faced with far more choices to make and far fewer criteria with which to make them. He has had to cope with this school-life dichotomy from his earliest contacts with formal education. Many students, from the dissatisfied in the ghetto to the restless in suburbia, are refusing to listen to our promises of preparation for the future, because our preparation for the present is proving ineffectual. Out of this kind of confrontation arise the various types and degrees of student protest. In foreign language the protest is a silent one, which we call "attrition," arising from the student's inability to find relevance in his foreign-language studies. He looks at his teachers, who stand with one foot in each of two worlds—the one that was and the one that is becoming—and he tries to manufacture a way to live in the only world he knows, the world in which he lives. His cries for help, be they violent demonstrations or a quiet "dropping out," are pleas to his elders to recognize his plight.

It is to the problem of the student in his world that the ILP-ACTFL National Invitational Work Conference addressed itself. The two major problems in the area of FLES, the newest of the foreign-language entries into the curriculum, were identified as the need to relate the foreign-language experience more closely to the elementary schoolchild and the need to secure the acceptance of FLES by other elementary educators. The meetings began with the premise that FLES education, in order to provide the most meaningful experience possible for the elementary pupil, must be integrated horizontally into the total

elementary curriculum as well as vertically into the long language sequence. The program brought together experts from several areas of elementary education to determine the trends on this level and to learn what responses other elementary educators are making to the student's needs and interests. Both the elementary educators and the foreign-language specialists present set about some exploratory dialogues to postulate some roles that foreign language might fill in the emerging elementary education. The dialogues were attempts not to find solutions but to test the process.

Bruce Joyce took notice of the defensive postures that can develop when specialists in several areas try to come together. He suggested that we approach the dialogues "as educators here to learn how to give children greater options in their environment, to teach them how to control their environment more fully, rather than to seek ways of intruding our area by itself into prominence in the schools." This same spirit guided the preparation of this report and must guide any dialogues growing out of its use.

The five position papers are reproduced with the sections that evoke the most discussion italicized. The italicized sections, therefore, represent those areas upon which the foreign-language specialists most focused their attention and questions. Those sections of the papers identified for further study or in-depth dialogue are set in **boldface type.** The bold type thus serves to indicate those areas in need of extensive exploration and intensive examination in the local or regional dialogue situation. Borrowing from John Bockman, the editors have included a final section, "Managing Change," that is intended to give the participants in dialogues yet to come some specific areas for consideration. Mr. Bockman, writing in the Arizona *Forum,* discusses societal change and the need for foreign-language teachers to adopt a positive attitude toward it:

> Our professional responsibility is not to stop change or to stampede it, but to manage it. A positive attitude toward change—an acceptance of its normality and desirability—appears requisite to its effective management.*

What we have tried to provide through the Conference and this report is a format or framework for *managing change,* a machinery permitting us to make the adjustments necessary to keep our educational offerings relevant to the student and his world. We shall need the aid of our elementary school colleagues to determine tentative answers for foreign language; then we can set about designing programs that will be a vital and contributing factor in preparing the student for his environment and for decision-making in any "world" into which he may be projected.

Lorraine A. Strasheim
Director, Indiana Language Program

*John F. Bockman, "The Use of Behavioral Objectives in Foreign Language Teaching," *Forum,* 14 (Jan. 1969), 3.

1

Psychological and Educational Considerations in Early Language Learning*

S. Jay Samuels
Professor of Educational Psychology
Member, Center for Research on Human Learning
University of Minnesota

Scholar-Sympathizer
Mildred Donoghue
Professor of Elementary and Secondary Education
California State College at Fullerton

Practitioner
Edward H. Bourque
Curriculum Consultant for Foreign Languages
Fairfield, Connecticut

* Appreciation is extended to the European Seminar on Learning and the Educational Process and to the Center for Research on Human Learning at the University of Minnesota for providing the time and facilities for writing this paper. The author also wishes to thank Sarah Lundsteen and Fiona Murray for reading an earlier version of this paper.

This paper on early foreign-language learning has several objectives. First, I would like to review the evidence for introducing foreign languages in the elementary school. Secondly, I would like to present several arguments as to why one should be cautious before accepting claims that a particular method of foreign-language instruction has support from either linguistics or psychology. Finally, although there are no breakthroughs to report, I would like to present a model for teaching as well as a model for mastery learning that can improve the quality of instruction.

Support for Early Language Teaching

The teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools (FLES) is of relatively recent origin. Approximately thirty years ago the International Bureau of Education found that out of fifty countries responding to its questionnaire, only nine had FLES programs, and the United States was not one of them.[1] When a similar survey was made by UNESCO[2] in 1961, thirty-nine nations, including the United States, reported having FLES programs. Realizing that the development of second language skills was in our national interest, Congress included in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 provisions for encouraging and supporting foreign-language teaching and research. Nationally important men such as Rickover, Bestor, Woodring, and Conant, though representing divergent political viewpoints, agreed that more foreign-language study should take place in our schools.[3]

Encouragement for the early introduction of foreign languages in the elementary school came from several sources. The Modern Language Association[4] recommended that to achieve mastery foreign languages should be taught for ten or more years, through grade twelve. It would appear, however, that the time recommended may be somewhat arbitrary, since numerous factors interact to determine the time necessary for foreign-language mastery. A second source of encouragement has come from the neurologist Wilder Penfield.[5] Penfield says that there are physiological reasons for starting second-language learning when the child is young. He draws support for his viewpoint from the fact that children—but not adults—can learn to speak again following injury to the speech area in the dominant cerebral hemisphere. From this and other sources of evidence he suggests that instruction in foreign languages should start prior to age ten. It is important to note, however, that Penfield's claims are drawn from logical inference, and,

ultimately, decisions as to optimal ages to begin second languages, methods of instruction, and length of instruction, to mention just a few, should be based on research findings as well as the specific and general objectives of the language program and the school. The response to these and several other forms of encouragement has been favorable, and a number of foreign-language programs at the elementary school level has been introduced. Consequently, it has been possible to test the claims regarding the advantages of early foreign-language training.

Learning the Sound System of a Language

There is some evidence to support the claim that younger students learn to pronounce foreign languages better than do older students. At the University of Chicago Elementary School, third and fourth graders began the study of French, receiving twenty minutes of daily instruction. Dunkel and Pillet[6] reported that, after two years of studying, 11 percent of the students had "near-perfect" pronunciation, 36 percent had superior pronunciation, 39 percent were "comparable to the average adult learner," and 14 percent had great difficulty with pronunciation. Max Kirch[7] also found that, in comparison with adults, children in grades one, three, and six had superior pronunciation, and that the younger the child, the better the pronunciation.

Counterfindings have been reported by Grinder, Otomo, and Toyota,[8] who found that accuracy in pronouncing Japanese increased from grades two through four. Bland and Keislar,[9] who had children go through a French audiolingual pilot program, found "no evidence that the younger children had better pronunciation." It is important to note that the Bland and Keislar study used only a small sample consisting of four kindergartners and six fifth graders. Furthermore, both studies reporting counterfindings made comparisons among children of the same age group. *The critical comparisons would be among children younger than ten, a group in their mid-teens, and a college group.*

In light of these conflicting findings, it would appear to be important to conduct a study under laboratory conditions to determine the relationship between age and ability to achieve a near-native accent in a foreign language. Since the teaching of syntax and vocabulary would not be an important focal point of the study, and since important evidence could be gathered from just a sample of the sounds found in representative words and phrases in the second language, a study such as this would be relatively simple to execute.

Carroll[10] (1966), while noting the paucity of experimental evidence on the relationship between age and ability to speak a foreign language with a good accent, stated that the evidence available suggests that the earlier the child starts to learn a foreign language, the faster he will speak with a good accent. Although foreign language teachers have stressed the importance of pronunciation, there is no research on the effect of a foreign accent on intelligibility. Carroll[11] (1966) is also of the opinion that the ease with which children learn to speak with a good accent has led to the mistaken belief that other aspects of foreign-language learning are equally easy for children.

Learning Vocabulary and Syntax

Do younger students learn the vocabulary and grammar of a foreign language faster than do older students? Available information fails to provide clear-cut answers. If one is willing to accept studies of paired-associate learning as models that partially represent the association process in certain kinds of vocabulary-learning tasks, then the evidence seems to indicate that when the pairs to be learned represent a difficult task, college students are superior to elementary school students. Carroll[12] (1966) agrees that, at least in laboratory settings, adults seem superior to children in vocabulary acquisition. On the question of grammar, Carroll said in his 1966 paper, "I believe the evidence suggests that children learn control of grammatical structure at about the same rate as adults."

In the Dunkel and Pillet (1957) study referred to previously, elementary school students with two years of French and college students with one or two *quarters* of French were given the same general French test. The results indicated that the elementary school students were not too far behind the college students, and in one comparison, one fifth of the children were above the median of the college group. Comparisons such as this, however, must be interpreted with caution, since it is difficult to determine whether the time devoted by each group to the study of the foreign language is in any way comparable. The Dunkel and Pillet findings further indicated that the children's ability to speak spontaneously was disappointing.

On the basis of this limited evidence, one might conclude that children enjoy a special advantage in comparison to adults in learning to speak with a good accent but are not better than adults in vocabulary and syntax acquisition. *Two of the variables that have been discussed—accuracy in pronunciation and vocabulary acquisition—seem especially amenable to tightly designed*

laboratory investigation, and it is suggested that language teachers and educational psychologists join forces to design and conduct research in these areas. Some basic questions that must be considered in the design of these experiments have been discussed in a paper by Samuels[13] (1969).

Given that the learner has sufficient aptitude, sufficient time, adequate instruction, appropriate materials, and enough perseverance, it seems probable that he will learn a second language. Conversely, when the learner's aptitude is low, when an insufficient amount of time is given to instruction, when the materials are inadequate, and when the learner fails to persevere, the prognosis seems poor. Birkmaier and Lange[14] (1967) have summarized the reasons why some FLES programs have had problems. They have run into difficulty for lack of continuity and coordination of the program through the grades and unrealistic expectations. Aware of these shortcomings, language teachers and other educators have looked to the disciplines of linguistics and psychology for help with regard to the teaching of foreign languages.

Role of Linguistics and Psychology in Foreign-Language Teaching

Chomsky[15] (1966) has been skeptical that either linguistics or psychology have much of practical value to offer education. He has said that while these disciplines may offer insights useful to the language teacher, these must be demonstrated and cannot be presumed. His skepticism—though shocking to many teachers—is healthy, since an educational technology cannot rest upon empty shibboleths and untested methods. Chomsky's criticism has been directed at the assumption—partly supported by linguists themselves—that linguistic competence can be learned through practicing a fixed stock of syntactic patterns in pattern drill exercises. When a speaker has competence in a language, he has internalized a set of highly abstract rules about grammatical structure that permit him to generate sentences in new and untried combinations and that permit him also to comprehend the novel utterances of another speaker of the language.

Whereas in the past many teachers were willing to adopt uncritically habit-formation techniques, because it appeared that language was a set of habits from which the speaker generalized new utterances, it now appears that many teachers are ready to return to the teaching of rules in the hope that rule-governed behavior will be acquired by the learner.[16] While it does appear that at the end of a long period of training a fluent speaker of a foreign language has internalized a generative grammar permitting him to produce novel utterances in that language, it is important to note that competence is the end product of an extended period of training, and it may be that it is impossible for the student to acquire competence by primarily giving him the highly abstract rules of that language. To complicate matters still further, no complete generative grammar has ever been written for any language.

While Chomsky has cautioned the teacher about the uncritical use of "findings" from linguistics and psychology, this writer wishes to caution the teacher about the use of psychology to justify a particular teaching method. Two of the more popular methods used to teach foreign languages are the audiolingual method and the grammar-translation method.* The audiolingual method emphasizes auditory discrimination, oral production, and making habits automatic through pattern practice. The grammar-translation method is a cognitive code-learning procedure "that proposes foreign language learning to be a process of acquiring conscious control of the patterns of a second language largely through study and analysis of these patterns."[17] Rivers[18] (1964), for example, examined the basic assumptions of the audiolingual method and found support for some of them in behavioristic psychology. Where support could not be found in behavioristic psychology, she turned to Gestalt psychology. Others have found support for the audiolingual method in the principles set forth by Skinner, while support for the grammar-translation method has been sought in Gestalt psychology. Neither method has a particularly sound basis in psychological theory. The attempt to support a practice by going to psychology on a *post hoc* basis seems unjustified.

The search for psychological support for a teaching method has an antecedent in the field of reading. Educators who supported the whole-word method of teaching reading used the findings of Cattell[19] (1885), as well as findings from Gestalt psychology. Cattell found that skilled readers were able to recognize a short word in about as little time as it took to recognize a single letter. This finding was used to justify the practice of introducing the child to reading through having him learn to read the whole word. The reasoning was fallacious in a number of ways: (1) the perceptual processes of skilled and naive readers are very different; (2) as the words became more difficult, even

* Editor's Note: While foreign-language specialists distinguish among teaching *approach*, teaching *method*, and teaching *technique*, it was thought that this distinction need not be made in this author's text.

adults were forced into more careful analysis of the word elements; and (3) it is often a poor procedure, once having identified the skill of a sophisticated learner, to start a naive learner at the same endpoint. This last observation is relevant to the point made earlier, that although a skilled speaker of a language has acquired a set of abstract rules that he uses to produce and comprehend sentences in a foreign language, it may be unwise to attempt to have the naive learner internalize the rules early in the learning process. *Returning again to the major point, it would seem that the justification for an educational method should rest not on theory but on empirical investigations that provide information on the efficiency of the method in terms of helping students to achieve the course objectives.*

Despite the need for precautions in accepting some of the claims drawn from linguistic and psychological theory, psychology does have something to offer education. What it has to offer does not come in the form of a "breakthrough," but rather in the simple statement of conditions and procedures that can promote learning and that, if violated, tend to retard learning. Thus, the teaching model and the learning model (Carroll,[20] 1963) *that will be presented are useful conceptual tools for the teaching of school subjects. Many of the difficulties encountered by FLES programs can be explained by the fact that some of the basic principles set forth in these models have been ignored. Adherence to these principles should help to correct the problems.*

The model of the teaching process shown in Figure 1 has six stages. It was designed for use at the classroom level to indicate to the teacher the sequence of steps he should follow in the instructional process. To a considerable extent the model operationalizes the definition of teaching. Teaching is viewed by this writer as the presentation of stimuli by the teacher (these stimuli include spoken as well as printed instructions and conditions for practice) in order to maximize the probability that the students will achieve the course objectives. Thus, objectives should be known beforehand, and the teaching should be directed toward the attainment of objectives.

Figure 1. Model of Teaching Process

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6
Statement of objectives for each unit	Unit tests made available to teacher prior to Stage 3	Preparation and planning for teaching	Teaching	Measurement: Administration of unit tests Reteaching, or student studies unit again	Evaluation and decision point-based on test data

Before proceeding further, a brief overview of the teaching model might be helpful. Stage 1 of the figure indicates to the teacher the objectives of the unit, that is, what skills the student will be required to master, the conditions of testing, and the level of performance required for passing on to the next unit. More detailed information on how to write objectives can be found in Mager's[21] book (1962). Stage 2 indicates that the unit tests are available prior to teaching the unit. Each unit test would contain questions that sample the objectives of that unit. The advantage in having written both the objectives and the unit tests prior to teaching is that they provide a focus for planning the teaching strategy. Stage 3 involves preparation and planning, gathering materials, and deciding upon the particular instructional strategy. In Stage 4 the instructor teaches the particular instructional strategy. In objectives according to plan. Unit tests are administered in Stage 5 to provide information for decision-making. In the last stage, the teacher evaluates the test performance of each student. The major purpose of the unit test is not to grade the students but to provide information to the teacher for decision-making. For students who have failed to reach the criterion, remedial action must be taken. The tests can be used diagnostically, indicating specific areas where the student needs additional help. If a sufficiently large number of students has failed to reach the criterion, the teacher may wish to reteach the unit using a somewhat different strategy. If a sufficiently large number has mastered the unit, he may decide to advance to the next unit.

The model of the teaching process has been outlined for teaching a unit. Daily lessons should follow a similar pattern. Objectives of the daily lesson, which are known in advance, help the teacher to plan his lesson. Generally, only a limited number of objectives, perhaps only one or two, can be realized in a single lesson at the elementary school level. When practical, at the start of a lesson, these objectives should be communicated to the students. Gathering

materials such as books, pictures, slides, filmstrips, recordings, and other audio-visual materials, as well as planning the particular lesson, must be done in advance. Teaching the daily lesson follows a pattern determined by the unit. A most important part of the lesson is evaluation. The evaluation can be informal in the sense that the teacher notes how particular students respond during class. The evaluation can be formal in the sense that it is based on short tests; the value of regular, short observations that are used diagnostically is that they do not take much time to administer or to score. Information from these tests helps the teacher to decide the pace of instruction for the class as a whole and indicates which students require special help.

Objectives and Unit Tests

Within the scope of the teaching model just outlined, the classroom teacher makes many important decisions regarding strategies to use in teaching, the pace of instruction, and diagnosis and remediation of learning difficulties. One important decision that teachers should not make relates to objectives and their sequencing for a particular grade level. When teachers who are in the classroom are required to make these decisions for their particular class, poor articulation and coordination between grades often result. This has been a problem that some FLES programs have encountered.

Once a school system decides to have a FLES program, it would appear to be an educationally wise policy to postpone the actual teaching until an articulated program of objectives and unit tests has been established. There are several advantages in having the unit tests prior to teaching. Since designing good tests is a time-consuming task, the teacher's time would be conserved so that he could devote it to planning, teaching, diagnosing, and remediation. Secondly, the tests would provide a target that would aid him in unit planning.

A study was done by Gordon[22] (1963) on the relationship between task-focus and student achievement. In the study, teachers were identified by their teaching style. At the risk of some oversimplifying, task-oriented teachers were identified as those who had specific objectives in mind and directed their teaching toward these goals. Ritual-oriented teachers did not have specific goals toward which their teaching was aimed. Gordon found that task-oriented teachers were more successful than ritual-oriented teachers in promoting student achievement.

When planning general objectives for a FLES program prior to the introduction of actual teaching, realistic goals should be established. If the course of study is planned for grades three, four, five, and six with 20 minutes of instruction given daily for a total of 240 hours, then the objectives for language proficiency should be somewhat limited. A study of achievement in Spanish among a group of highly motivated Peace Corps candidates who were in an intensive language program revealed that for the candidate with average aptitude, 200 hours of instruction were insufficient and 400 hours were needed to train him properly for service in the field.[23] *One problem FLES programs have had is that unreasonably high expectations were set up. When children failed to meet the expectations, disillusionment with the FLES program resulted.* In connection with the need to have reasonable expectations, it would seem unwarranted to expect children to have facility in reading or writing when they have been trained primarily in speaking and listening. There is evidence to show that training for one objective—speaking and listening or reading and writing—does not transfer directly to the other objective (Dostal,[24] 1960; Scherer and Wertheimer,[25] 1964).

School Organization

Although educators would prefer to train students for subject-matter mastery, several factors militate against achieving this objective. One of the main factors preventing mastery is the organization of the schools, which is based on a business model rather than a learning model (Callahan,[26] 1962). The business model reflects an input-output scheme in which time is fixed. Raw material, of somewhat varying quality depending upon the degree of selectivity at the input stage, is fed in at one end. The raw material is processed in a standard fashion, and the finished product represents the output. With this model a certain percent of the final product is expected to be defective. These defects can be tolerated as long as the proportion of defects is low enough to permit the organization to show a profit. This input-output fixed-time model was adapted to American educational needs because large numbers of children had to be educated, because student-accounting and articulation problems had to be simplified at the administrative level, and because, unlike business, schools did not have to show a "profit." This model, then, was set up primarily as an administrative convenience rather than as a model to promote learning.

There are several recognizable features of the input-output fixed-time business model in school organization. Students are generally age-graded and processed through the system as a group. Aptitude tests may be used to preselect students who will succeed given a fixed amount of practice and standardized methodology. The time devoted to processing is fixed. Test information and grades are used largely

as an index of product quality for purposes of allocating students to levels of the educational hierarchy. The practice of grading on the curve reflects the student's relative position in his class. This is useful information for purposes of allocation, but the difference in test achievement may be trivial and the grades do not necessarily represent subject-matter mastery.

Unlike the input-output fixed-time model, which is not particularly conducive to mastery learning, a useful model has been developed by Carroll (1963). Although this model was not formulated primarily for mastery learning, it can be used in this context, and for purposes of this discussion it will be referred to at times as a "mastery model."

As seen in Figure 2, degree of mastery is a function of the ratio of the time the learner actually spends on the task to the total amount of time needed by the student. Thus, if the time spent on the task is equal to the time needed, mastery should result. Conversely, if time spent on the task is less than the time needed, mastery will not result. The five components of the model are: (1) time allowed for learning, (2) perseverance, (3) aptitude, (4) ability to understand instruction, and (5) quality of instruction. In the model, components of time spent on learning are time allowed and perseverance. Components of time needed for learning are aptitude, ability to understand instruction, and quality of instruction.

Figure 2. Model for Mastery Learning

$$\text{Degree of mastery} = \text{a function (F) of } \frac{\text{Time spent on the task (1. Time allowed 2. Perseverance)}}{\text{Time needed for the task (3. Aptitude 4. Ability to understand instruction 5. Quality of instruction)}}$$

(1) Time Allowed for Learning

Time spent in the mastery model means the amount of time spent actively engaged in learning and does not include time when the student is not oriented to his task. One component of time spent in learning is the amount of time the school allows for learning. Studies of paired-associate learning provide an interesting analog to the learning situation for the input-output fixed-time model as well as for the mastery learning model. One way to conduct a paired-associate learning experiment is to give all the learners a fixed number of exposures to the pairs. If the students are of varying intellectual ability and if the number of exposures given is adequate only for the more able learner, with this fixed-time method the distribution of scores on the learning criterion will resemble a bell-shaped curve, with a few students showing high achievement, a few showing low achievement, and most showing moderate achievement. Another method used in paired-associate learning studies is to require mastery. With this objective, time is a variable factor. All students achieve mastery, but the time necessary to do so is distributed normally. **Thus, comparing the two methods we find that in the fixed-time procedure, achievement is distributed normally, while in the variable-time procedure, time is distributed normally. It would appear that in the classroom where a mastery objective was in effect, the teaching procedure would have to make provisions for the different rates of student learning.** *It would appear advantageous within the context of a mastery program to find various ways for the low-aptitude child to get the extra time and instruction he needs.*

One FLES program does this by providing extra time after school for slower students (Brown and Fiks,[27] 1967). Bloom[28] (1968) reported that one third of the students in an algebra class were receiving as much tutorial instruction at home as they were receiving group instruction in school. For these students the relationship between mathematical aptitude and their achievement in the course was nearly zero. For those students who received no tutorial help, the relationship was high (.90).

(2) Perseverance

A second component of "time spent" is perseverance, which can be thought of as the amount of time the learner is willing to spend on the task. Psychological studies of "perseverance" have generally found that willingness to stick to a task is determined largely by the learner's reinforcement history and his subjective estimate of the probability of receiving a reward by remaining on the task. This latter point is complicated by the learner's decision

as to whether the reward for mastery is worth the time and effort. **Consequently, perseverance—a motivational variable—can be modified in a variety of ways, primarily by simplifying the task or by improving the quality of instruction so that reinforcement will come at more frequent intervals. These procedures should increase the learner's estimate of the probability of reinforcement.**

(3) Aptitude

The time needed for a task is influenced by the student's aptitude, the quality of instruction, and his ability to understand the instruction. Since time is a critical variable in the the mastery model, aptitude is defined as the amount of time the student needs to achieve a specified criterion of success. Support for this definition may be found by observing the achievement scores on standardized tests. Grade norms indicate that the scores of those with high aptitude are achieved by a majority of students at a later grade level (Bloom, 1968). Similar findings are available from paired-associate learning studies having the goal of learning to criterion. Nearly all students achieve the goal, but the time required to do so varies. *It should be understood, however, that aptitude is often specific to the the task at hand.*

Lenneberg[29] (1964), in his study of biological factors in language, indicated that the acquisition of one's native language results largely from biological development and that the ability to acquire language is relatively independent of that property called intelligence. Foreign-language aptitude also appears to be somewhat independent of intelligence. Carroll[30] (1960) has said that the facility to comprehend and speak a foreign language is a specific talent that is somewhat independent of those traits commonly measured on intelligence tests. Because general intelligence and foreign-language aptitude are not perfectly correlated, aptitude tests are superior to intelligence tests in predicting the rate of learning a foreign language.

One of the greatest problems encountered in FLES programs relates to the question of whether or not all students should receive foreign-language instruction. At the present time little is known about differences in foreign-language aptitude before the age of nine or ten. Since the audiolingual method, which is commonly used in FLES programs, places a premium on skills not ordinarily utilized on intelligence tests, it would appear unwise to select students on the basis of intelligence. Similarly it would be unwise to select on the basis of the child's reading score, because reading is not emphasized in FLES programs. Perhaps the wisest course of action for a school system to follow would be to permit all the students to receive instruction. Recognizing that students of lesser aptitude would require longer to complete the units, provision could be made for these students. Selection out of the program for those students who have unusual difficulty could occur at some suitable point.

(4) Ability To Understand Instruction

Another factor that influences the time needed for a task is the student's ability to understand instruction. Ability to understand instruction is distinct from foreign-language aptitude and can be thought of as a combination of general intelligence and verbal ability. General intelligence might be an important factor in foreign-language learning where inductive teaching procedures were used and the student had to discover the grammatical rule governing the form of a particular construction, whereas verbal ability might play an important role in situations where a verbal explanation was given and the student had to understand the explanation.

For example, an important FLES study by McKinnon[31] (1965) contrasted the "inductive" teaching of grammar, where the children were not given any special instructions, being allowed to figure the grammar out for themselves, with a "deductive" method, in which the teacher pointed out the structural features. He found that the deductive system produced superior learning. Obviously, the student's ability to understand the teacher's explanations in the deductive method is influenced by the quality of instruction.

(5) Quality of Instruction

The final aspect of time needed for learning is quality of instruction. Instructional quality, as traditionally viewed, is determined by the extent to which the sequencing of subject matter, teacher explanations, and the methodology of instruction are appropriate for a given learner. To a considerable extent the research that has been done on improving instruction has assumed that the teaching would be done within the context of an input-output fixed-time model. Therefore, these studies have attempted to increase the average performance of an entire class through manipulating some aspect of instruction.

While these studies provide information that is useful even with a mastery model, they fail to provide solutions for several problems

encountered with the mastery model. One problem that must be dealt with is the pacing of instruction. **Pacing is defined as the rate at which students are advanced through a unit. If the teacher's role is primarily that of tutor, and if the major instructional responsibility is handled by self-instructional devices, then the problem is fairly simple; the student advances at his own rate. But if the central teaching responsibility is handled by a teacher, the pacing problem is acute.** Since most schools with FLES programs have the teacher assume the central responsibility, no simple solution is forthcoming; the pace of instruction will be either too fast or too slow for some students. Although no perfect solution is available, a compromise solution can be worked out. For students with low foreign-language aptitude, additional time for learning will be required, and it would be the teacher's responsibility to set up the conditions of practice for the slower students. However, since the student's time should be spent wisely, it is important that the teacher diagnose the student's difficulty and take appropriate remedial measures. With the fixed-time model individual differences in aptitude are difficult to accommodate. However, with a variable-time mastery model it becomes easier to make provisions for individual differences.

Carroll's mastery model can thus be used effectively with the teaching model presented earlier. Whereas the teaching model describes the procedure to be followed to achieve mastery, the learning model states the conditions that must be satisfied for mastery to occur. Consequently, the two models fit together.

This discussion has led to three major conclusions. First, answers to questions dealing with the comparative ease with which different age groups learn the sound system, vocabulary, and grammar of a foreign language need to be provided through research. Secondly, the fixed-time model upon which our schools are presently organized does not lead to mastery learning for many students. Finally, it is suggested that by following the steps outlined in the teaching model and the model for mastery learning, foreign-language mastery can be achieved.

Footnotes

[1] **Mildred R. Donoghue,** *Foreign Languages and the Elementary School Child* (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1968), p. 3.

[2] "Second Language Teaching in Primary and Secondary Schools," *Education Abstracts,* 13 (New York: UNESCO Publications Center, 1961).

[3] **John B. Carroll,** "Foreign Languages for Children," *The National Elementary Principal,* 34 (1960), 1-7.

[4] "Foreign Languages in the Elementary School: A Statement of Policy" (New York: Modern Language Association, 1961).

[5] **Wilder Penfield** and **Lamar Roberts,** *Speech and Brain Mechanisms* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1959).

[6] **H. B. Dunkel** and **R. Pillet,** "A Second Year of French in Elementary School," *Elementary School Journal,* 58 (1957), 143-51.

[7] **H. B. Kirch,** "At What Age Elementary School Language Teaching?" *Modern Language Journal,* 40 (1956), 399-400.

[8] **R. E. Grinder, A. Otomo,** and **W. Toyota,** "Comparisons Between 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Grade Children in the Audio-Lingual Learning of Japanese as a Second Language" (Honolulu: Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii, 1961).

[9] **Merton Bland** and **Evan R. Keislar,** "A Self-Controlled Audio-Lingual Program for Children," *French Review,* 39 (1966), 266-76.

[10] **John B. Carroll,** "Trends and Research Developments in Research into Second Language Teaching to Young Children," Paper given at Amerika-Haus, Hamburg, May 11, 1966.

[11] **John B. Carroll,** "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last 5 Years," in "Language Teaching: Broader Contexts," ed. Robert G. Mead, Jr., *North East Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Reports of the Working Committees* (New York: Modern Language Association Materials Center, 1966), 12-42.

[12] **John B. Carroll,** "A Parametric Study of Language Training in the Peace Corps," Final Report for Contract PC-(W)-226 with the Peace Corps, 1966.

[13] **S. Jay Samuels,** "Design of Research in Reading," *The Reading Teacher* (Jan. 1969).

[14] **Emma Birkmaier** and **Dale L. Lange,** "Foreign Language Instruction," *Review of Educational Research,* 37 (1967), 199.

[15] **Noam Chomsky,** "Linguistic Theory," in "Language Teaching: Broader Contexts," ed. Robert G. Mead, Jr., *North East Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages: Reports of the Working Committees* (New York: Modern Language Association Materials Center, 1966).

[16] **Wilga M. Rivers,** "Grammar in Foreign Language Teaching," Proceedings of the 1967 MLA Conference on Applied Linguistics, *Modern Language Journal,* 52 (1968), 205-16.

[17] **Carroll,** "Research in Foreign Language Teaching: The Last 5 Years," 12-42.

[18] **Wilga M. Rivers,** *The Psychologist and the Foreign-Language Teacher* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

[19] **James M. Cattell,** "Über die Zeit der Erkennung und Benennung von Schrift-zeichen, Bildern und Farben," *Philoso-phische Studien,* 2 (1885), 635-50.

[20] **John B. Carroll,** "A Model of School Learning," *Teachers College Record* (1963-64), 723-33.

[21] **Robert F. Mager,** *Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction* (San Francisco: Fearon Publishers, 1962).

[22] **C. Wayne Gordon** and **Leta Adler,** *Dimensions of Teacher Leadership in Classroom Social Systems,* U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research, Project 1084 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963).

[23] **Carroll,** "A Parametric Study of Language Training in the Peace Corps."

[24] **Naida M. Dostal,** "Audio-Visual Second Language Learning: A Historical Review and Comparative Evaluation of the Use of Audio-Visual Instructional Materials and Teaching Techniques in First-Year High School French," unpublished dissertation (Wayne State University, 1960).

[25] **George A. C. Scherer** and **Michael Wertheimer,** *A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[26] **Raymond E. Callahan,** "Education and the Cult of Efficiency" (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[27] **George H. Brown** and **Alfred I. Fiks,** "Modern Approaches to Foreign Language Training: A Survey of Current Practices" (Washington: George Washington University, *HUMRRO,* 1967).

[28] **Benjamin S. Bloom,** "Learning for Mastery" (Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, 1968), 1.

[29] **Eric H. Lenneberg,** "A Biological Perspective of Language," in *New Directions in the Study of Language,* ed. Lenneberg (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964).

[30] **John B. Carroll,** "Wanted: A Research Basis for Educational Policy on Foreign Language Teaching," *Harvard Education Review,* 30 (1960), 128-40.

[31] **Kenneth R. McKinnon,** "An Experimental Study of the Learning of Syntax in Second Language Learning," unpublished dissertation (Harvard University, 1965).

2

The Emerging Elementary School as a Setting for Foreign-Language Instruction

Bruce R. Joyce
Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Scholar-Sympathizer
Violet Bergquist
Chairman, Spanish Teacher Education
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Practitioner
Robert Brooks
President, Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association
Elementary School Classroom Teacher
Cleveland, Ohio

When I was asked to prepare this paper, the charge given me was to attempt to characterize the trends in elementary school curriculum organization. The emerging picture thus presented was to serve as a backdrop against which strategies could be debated for locating the direction and form of foreign-language instruction in the elementary school of the future.

Prefatory remarks are necessary in two areas. First, no attempt is made here to evaluate various methods of teaching foreign languages in the elementary school. I am not competent to make such an evaluation. I *do* make the confident assumption, however, that present educational technology may provide the conditions for successfully teaching foreign languages in the elementary school to most children. Many of you are capable of using these conditions. You *know* how to teach foreign languages and, further, you have developed *several* successful technologies so that you have great potential flexibility in your area. You can, for example, adjust method to accommodate the style of the learner or use several methods for different purposes (as, for example, oral or written competence).

Secondly, no attempt is made to judge whether foreign languages *should* be taught. **For purposes of this discussion we make the assumption that foreign languages should be taught and that the particular problem area of this paper is to determine how foreign-language study can be shaped so that it will be compatible with the elementary school of the future and effective within it. Put another way, we will try to provide a basis on which you can build strategies of curriculum reform.**

The problem area will be approached in several stages. In the first part of the paper, I will deal with aspects of the dominant patterns in elementary school curriculum and organization. Particularly, I will examine the reasons why several kinds of curricular innovations in the elementary school have not become widespread and treat the rejection of innovations as functions of the curricular and organizational patterns (into which, by the way, the FLES programs were intruded in the early fifties). In the second part of the paper, I will develop and apply a structure for analyzing the emerging curricular and organizational patterns of the elementary school. In the third part of the paper, I will speculate on the possible future elementary school and, simultaneously, on strategies for introducing changes in any curriculum area into the elementary school. Special attention will be given to curriculum

areas that have not been traditional to the elementary school, as is the case with foreign languages.

The Elementary School That We Have Inherited

The most prominent features of most elementary schools, at the time when FLES really began to gather steam, continue with us at present, although the school is now overshadowed in many ways by the ferment and changes that are taking place. It is valuable to look at the structure of the present school, because it has so effectively rejected an enormous array of innovations in much the same fashion that the human body rejects foreign objects placed in it. That is, in dealing with innovations, the elementary school has expelled some, killed some, encapsulated some, and absorbed others into its ongoing system, which has continued unaffected, at least for the most part. To be more direct, we are able, in 1968, to look back at the sustained efforts of the academic curriculum reform movement and try to analyze why fifteen years of sustained innovative activity have left such a small mark on the school.

Organizational Patterns

The basic organizational pattern has been to have teachers who are multipurpose educationally, whether they work in self-contained classrooms or in departmentalized situations. Even if they have not been formally responsible for more than one subject, they have still carried on nearly all phases of instruction.

The average teachers in "self-contained" classrooms are incredibly overburdened. Usually they are expected to teach basic skills in the reading, arithmetic, and social studies curriculum areas. In addition, they try to teach children how to write and to give them some opportunity to write creatively. These same teachers are exhorted to introduce children to literature and basic information about the society's political and social heritage. Even subject specialists have many functions. That is, if they teach science, they teach several classes of science—and without the aid of laboratory assistants.

The basic staff of the elementary school has been backed up by specialists in those areas where the lack of skill of the average teacher has stood out to the point that it could not be ignored—namely, in art, music, and physical education. Although these areas are not given as much prominence in the school curriculum as are the "basic skills" and the social studies and literature, special teachers are provided because it is obvious that the average multipurpose teacher simply does not have the goods to do the job. It is only reasonable to suppose that he does not have the goods in many other areas, also, but these deficiencies are not as obvious as failures to sing or draw a picture might be.

Today, a library is usually provided in the average-size school and, if it is large enough, a librarian. There is also, usually, a small clerical staff and a custodial staff. (One of the really significant changes in public elementary schools during the last thirty years has been the spread of libraries and, just as important, the development of very broad concepts of library function. We will return to the library often, for it is a place of opportunity for the curriculum reformer!)

Now, since the self-contained pattern has continued to be the dominant pattern up through about the fifth or sixth grade, we should speak in terms of it with respect to the attempt to intrude innovations, such as foreign languages, into the elementary school arena. In the first case, since the teachers have had to do everything, they have had a constant task of choosing priorities. By tradition, the three Rs have dominated the mentality of the elementary schoolchildren as well. This dominance has existed to such an extent that it has been difficult to get the majority of those teachers to teach anything else. There has been very little laboratory science in the elementary school, for example, and there was very little mathematical theory until the "new math" mounted its substantial attack from the fifties on. At present, there is still virtually no literature taught in the average elementary school. American history and the geography of the world fare a little better in the upper grades, but not in the primary grades. Art, music, and physical education have their place in almost every classroom, because they are scheduled and taught by special teachers.

Busy teachers, trying to meet the individual needs of twenty-five or more children in five or six subject areas, trying to be sure that each child leaves the class able to read and count and write legibly, have not been addicted to taking on additional responsibilities, especially in less obviously utilitarian areas. This is the reason why there is little laboratory science, mathematical theory, creative writing, and literature in most elementary schools. The basic skills have the priority. In fact, the public (and teachers) are emotionally conservative in the skill areas. Because the skills are part of the process of socialization to our culture, tampering with them is taboo. The emotional appeal of "phonics" approaches, with emphasis on drilling the code, is—whatever the actual merits of the method—rooted in its place among the

tribal rituals of our culture.

It is into this organizational pattern that educators attempted to introduce the innovations of the middle fifties. To a teacher who was already unable to find time to teach creative writing or literature, the foreign-language program could hardly be expected to be regarded as welcome, and in most cases it was *not* welcome. A teacher would ask indirectly—teachers very rarely brought this out into the open—"Am I to stop teaching reading? Shall I stop teaching social studies? I can't teach some of the kids to read English, and now you expect me to teach a foreign language." In other words, the organizational pattern of the elementary school could scarcely have been contrived to provide less fertile ground for the introduction of a new and strange curriculum area. Even in those curriculum areas which were well established, but which the academic reform movement has only attempted to improve, such as mathematics, the process of intruding new content (as from mathematical theory) and of teaching teachers new methods (as more inductive methods) has been a very slow and a not very rewarding process. Even today, after all the ballyhoo, all the in-service courses, all the pressures from the public, and all the changes in instructional materials, mathematical theory is not the primary characteristic of the arithmetic taught in our elementary schools. The dominant characteristic is just what it was before the academic reform movement started; that is, computation and the so-called number facts reign supreme. There *has* been *some* change, of course, and, in some schools *much* change. **Looking at all the attempts to develop curricular changes, I think that it is safest to say that the attempts have been most successful in those areas where they are wedded to an already well-entrenched area. Thus, mathematics shows an easily discernible effect from the efforts of the fifties and early sixties, science shows less, and foreign languages . . ?!**

Teacher Competence

Every investigation of the academic competence of teachers has revealed, even in those areas that dominate the elementary school, that very few teachers consider themselves competent, or, according to the evidence, are in any sense of the word highly qualified. Back in 1937, Learned and Wood, studying the elementary school teachers in Pennsylvania, found that 25 percent of the graduating seniors from the teachers colleges scored below the top 25 percent of the high school graduates of the same year on the same scholastic achievement tests.[1] In other words, 25 percent of the people who were setting out to teach physics, social studies, English, and so on, in the secondary schools of Pennsylvania knew less, according to the standardized tests, than 25 percent of the children they were supposedly going to teach! Since the Learned and Wood study, there have been other investigations resulting in similar conclusions. Tests of mathematical theory frequently show that teachers' average achievement is that of the upper-grade elementary school student. The same is true in terms of their knowledge of history. Teachers are presently making it quite clear that curriculum reform in the social sciences will be severely curtailed because they are, by their own admission, insufficiently prepared in the social sciences. Attempts to introduce anthropology, history, economics, social psychology, sociology, and even geography into elementary education are meeting with resistance on this ground.

Amid such a scene, what can we say of the competence of the teacher to teach foreign languages? Or of the priority that he or school officials are likely to give to the business of improving his competence in an area that does not match the usual socializing roles of the school. By his own view, the elementary school teacher does not know much mathematics, much science, much social science, or much literature (remember, we are not speaking of *all* teachers here, but the average teacher). How can we expect him to take on a new area and begin to master it? Or, if we provide a specialist or a media-mediated curriculum system, can we expect our teachers to give up much time from what they see as the mainstream of the school? Yet, that is exactly what the central strategy of the foreign-language movement (and most other curriculum areas that comprised the general academic reform movement) called for. In the absence of a native-speaking teacher, the classroom teacher was to be the mediator of instruction, or was to administer an instructional system. It is no wonder that teachers did not come in droves to the universities to study French, or to learn to operate language laboratories.

The Structure of the Curriculum Areas

The organizational situation described above is transcended only by the superior teacher whose extraordinary subject-matter competence, ease in managing children, skill in diagnosing and providing for individual differences, and skill as a group-inquiry leader make it possible for him to do all the jobs that he is being asked to do and not to become bogged down in a morass of expository teaching. The curriculum areas are usually described in methods textbooks as if this paragon were its sole agent. Theoretically, the teacher would organize the class into a miniature

democracy that would define and attack significant problems, learning in the course of its inquiry the modes of the scholarly world and struggling toward a comprehension of the contemporary social world.[2] The curriculum guides were designed to be exactly what the word "guide" implies—criteria by which the teacher could make instructional decisions. He was not to feel bound by the curriculum but, rather, was to use the guides as tools as he made and carried out instructional decisions.[3] In practice, however, the curriculum guide frequently became a boundary, and the boundary effect was compounded by the commercial publishers who, understandably enough, commonly used the curriculum guides as their yardsticks for the preparation of textbooks. The textbooks, in turn, since they had been written, at least purportedly, by experts in the curriculum fields, became guidelines for the construction of more curriculum guides; and this cycle perpetuated the *status quo* in most of the curriculum areas for years on end. It is really amazing how little the guides of the late twenties differ from those of the early sixties in most curriculum areas.

The curricula were structured generally in sequences of topics, although certain themes were identified to provide continuity throughout the curriculum. For example, in arithmetic the social application of number was a frequent theme that was to be stressed throughout the grades; and specified topics that gave emphasis to this theme, such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, were to be studied. Integration among the curriculum areas was stressed. The emphasis on topics and on units within subject-matter areas lent itself, unfortunately, to conservative educational practices. Certain units or topics became identified as belonging to certain grades and, in fact, essential to them. Hence, all over the country in the social studies, an onlooker would find a sequential history of the United States being taught in the fifth and sixth grades, beginning with the early explorers and the colonization of America and extending until some time around the First World War. Similarly, the regional geography of the United States, or of the Western hemisphere, often correlated with the history, tended to occupy the fifth grade, and in sixth grade the geography of the rest of the world was often treated. The same was true in the other curriculum areas. Teachers thought of themselves in terms of grades. A teacher who taught the fifth grade in Omaha, Nebraska, and moved to Washington, D. C., could count on a curriculum in his new environment similar to the one in use in the old environment. It is because of this kind of situation that teachers have come to regard themselves as third-grade teachers, fifth-grade teachers, fourth-grade teachers, and the like. In terms of content and method those designations were really quite apropos (us maddened theoreticians to the contrary). An assumptive world has developed in which "ladders" of content are the most prominent features, and education consists of climbing the ladders. Also, in theory at least, the doctrine of integration of subject areas has been prevalent. Art, music, and the like were to be "integrated" with the social studies and language arts, and so on. *That is, much schooling was to be carried on in activity-projects where there were no clear lines between the subject areas. Now the tendency toward emphasis on topics in the curriculum became for a new curriculum area, like the foreign languages, a kind of Scylla, looming on one side of the narrow straits, while the belief in integration was the Charybdis on the other side. If a movement toward a new curriculum area was not defeated because it could not displace the content that had become fixed in the grades, it was just as likely to be swallowed up in the whirlpool of integration and dissipated until it was nothing. The operation of swallowing-through-integration would go something like this:*

"When shall we teach the foreign language?" asks the principal.

"We don't have time, unless we integrate it with the social studies," replies the teacher.

"Oh good. Let's teach Spanish words when we're studying Mexico, and some French words when we're studying France. . . ."

And, bingo, there goes your language program!

Of course, this does not characterize every place or every program, but because the supply of foreign-language teachers was so small, and equipment for teaching without teachers who were highly competent in the language was lacking, in most places teaching the foreign languages was at the mercy of the traditions of the elementary school, its primitive organizational patterns, and its curriculum.

Present Trends in Curriculum and School Organization

It is convenient to characterize institutional trends in two broad categories. The first has to do with the actions of reformers who by their effort create many of the trends that lead to the future. The second is the workings of forces that produce change by the way they affect the school. These forces may operate intentionally, as the reformers do, but more often they are simply pressures of circumstances that bring about new things without actually

intending to do so. An example of this in the institution of the family is the effect that high geographic mobility has had on the extended family. As people have become more and more mobile, the generations have become more and more separated from each other, which was not the purpose of mobility. No one said, "Let's move people around so that the extended family shrinks and the conjugal family becomes more central." So it is with the schools. The important concept is that some things are produced by reformers, and other things are produced by the stress of circumstances.

It is much easier for us to detect the efforts of reformers than it is to see the trends of circumstances, because the reformers have to make an overt effort to change things. Their effort involves writing and speaking and demonstrating what can be done. The forces of circumstance, however, can be quiet and unseen until they have caused considerable change. One example is worth noting to make the point. In the largest cities of the United States the teacher supply has steadily dwindled. It has slowly come about that in many of the nation's largest cities, about one third of the teaching positions have to be filled by temporary personnel simply because there are no licensed personnel to fill the positions. When the mass of unlicensed people reaches that extent, there are many effects on the system. For example, principals try to put the best teachers in the early grades, so that the children get a good start in the school, and the junior high and the upper grades become denuded of talented teachers. Because academic students are attractive to many teachers, senior teachers select the academic courses in the eleventh and twelfth grades. The result is that the beginning and ending years are not badly staffed, but the situation from grades three or four to ten can be pretty incredible. No one intended that this situation should develop, but it is a trend and a most important one that has to be considered seriously in matters pertaining to school reforms in the large cities. The point is that the reform movements and apparent trends that we are about to discuss may be but tiny determinants of the future when we compare them with forces only dimly perceived now. Nonetheless, we must try. Let us look first at some of the movements that are being generated by reformers, including technological advances, and then try to predict the trends that are likely to persist.

The Reformers and the Academic Disciplines

An important trend has been generated by the attempt of scholars to bring the central ideas and modes of inquiry of the scholarly disciplines into curricula for young children. The philosophy and psychology of the movement still has not been better stated than in Bruner's 1961 book, *The Process of Education*.[4] He postulated that each subject had a system of organizing ideas that he called its structure and that the structure controlled inquiry, provided the outlines of the storehouse of knowledge within each discipline, and functioned also to enable scholars to communicate with one another. He further postulated that the benefits of teaching the structures of the disciplines to the child were fourfold. First, they would bring the child in contact with the most advanced thinking in the disciplines; even the introductory student would participate in knowledge of the ideas used by the most advanced theorists. Secondly, the structure would provide an intellectual framework that would assist the student in storing and retrieving information. Thirdly, the structure would provide a set of ideas and ways of thinking that could be transferred easily to problem situations far removed from the school settings. Finally, knowing the fundamental ideas of the disciplines would improve the student's comprehension of the world; it would enable him to think better about his environment.

These ideas have guided the program of reform that was known as the new mathematics, the new science, the new social studies, and Project English. As you all know better than I, it has found its way into foreign-language study, where the organizing ideas from linguistics have been used in several ways. Such devices as matching the linguistic structures of a language to be learned with a language already known in order to help the student grasp the similarities and differences between what he knows and what he is attempting to learn are entirely in tune with the thrust of academic curriculum reform from 1955 to the present.

A major difficulty in this reform—and a major object of attention—has been that the average school teacher has not usually been equipped with knowledge of the fundamental organizing ideas around which the academic reform movement has been built. Also, because of the enormously rapid turnover of teachers in the United States, retraining is a relatively staggering task. (Since it takes three or four years to retrain teachers of a given district, there has been a 60 to 80 percent turnover during the same period, which puts you, to put it gently, back where you began.) And very few of the newly trained elementary school teachers control the disciplines. (You can judge from your own field!) **As a consequence, the academic reform movement has come to depend more and more heavily on instructional materials that are administered by a teacher who operates**

more or less as a technician. These, of course, have been dubbed "teacher-proof" materials and have been vigorously disliked by some and praised by others. So far, however, there is very little firm evidence that even the use of teacher-proof materials can bring the disciplines into the schools so that they persist. Many reformers feel that even the more complex and complete systems of materials such as those developed by the Physical Science Study Committee, the Chemical Bonds Group, the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Committee, the School Mathematics Study Group, the Anthropology Curriculum Project, and so on have not had much effect on the actual instruction within the school. This belief is especially strong at the elementary school level. **In many situations, a ready supply of enthusiastic teachers has not materialized and been combined with the proper conditions for teaching, the right materials, the needed in-service training. In some classrooms, of course, we see excellent, scholarly teaching, but I am speaking about the norm.**

It seems reasonable that where the supply of competent people is limited, we can expect that the most qualified personnel will be utilized in the areas that are considered to be basic. Therefore, in reading and arithmetic, for example, we can expect to see inducements to draw teachers to those areas. In areas that are conceived to be tangential, such as the social studies, creative writing, and foreign languages, we can expect to see less effort by school officials.

Reform in School Organization

A substantial reform effort has been mounted since the early 1950s. The direction is away from the multipurpose teacher who works alone toward the specialist who works in teams with other specialists. The movement has been accompanied by the introduction of paraprofessionals such as teacher aides into classrooms. There is an effort to individualize instruction more fully and at the same time to provide more modes of mass instruction, as well as individualized instruction, within the school. For example, in many of the team-teaching situations, teachers are working with far smaller groups of children than is possible when they work alone; and teachers also work with considerably larger groups of children in lectures, demonstrations, and other large-group activities.[5]

This reform movement in school organization has rather obvious implications for foreign-language teaching in the elementary school, because the more that team teaching is seen as a group of specialists working together, the more likely it is that roles can be found for persons who are competent in the foreign languages and for instructional systems managers.

It must be stated, however, that team teaching and nongrading have not exactly taken the nation by storm. Perhaps the chief implication so far, in terms of the future, is that many shibboleths have been broken down. For example, in the early days of team teaching, it was asserted by some educators that exposing very young children to teams of teachers would disorient them, whereas the warmth of the self-contained classroom would provide a security and simplicity in environment, which supposedly was good for the children. This sort of nonsense has been pretty well dispelled, although you still hear the argument occasionally. Another was that teacher aides could not be permitted to do any instructional function that brought them into direct contact with children. This position has now reached the status of arguing that parents should not be allowed to have children until they have teaching certificates. It is now generally recognized that many people who have not completed thirty credits in education courses or a subject major in one of the disciplines can nonetheless perform many useful functions in the elementary school. Furthermore, the movement has been accompanied by a revolution in school architecture, spearheaded, I believe, by the Educational Facilities Laboratories. More flexible, open school designs have resulted. Schools are being built that are tailored for cooperative teaching. **Probably more important, schools are now being designed in such a way that many different kinds of staff-utilization patterns can be created over the years, and the building itself does not lock a staff into an obsolete pattern of organization.**

Differentiated Teacher Roles

Although the concept of differentiation of teacher roles has been developed concurrently with the movements toward team teaching and nongrading, it deserves separate attention, because the major professional organizations are presently sponsoring various plans of role differentiation that can give enormous flexibility to the tailoring of programs in the elementary school. For example, in *Man, Media, and Machines,* I advocated direct instructional teams of quite a variety of personnel surrounded by many supporting personnel.[6] Teachers under the plan would play about fifteen different distinct roles within a single elementary school organization. Perhaps most significant, a consensus is emerging that the school of the future will have to include training components for teachers that will enable them to master new and emerging roles and even to create them as the need arises.

The notion of a preservice education that prepares the teacher for specific roles within the school is beginning to be challenged, and we are coming toward the concept of a much more general professional teacher education followed by specific technical role-training within the school itself.[7]

The Reform in Support Systems

During the 1960s, especially, we are seeing the growth and testing of many kinds of systems that can support the behavior of teachers and learners both in school settings and out of them. For example, the growth of hardware to manage random-access data storage and retrieval systems will, as software is created to enable them to operate efficiently, bring within the reach of every child instructional programs on wide varieties of subjects and information sources of many kinds. These support systems will give the learner and the teacher much more ability to control what they do at any given moment. For example, in my own area of the social studies, we have developed random-access data storage and retrieval systems on cultures that make as many as three thousand instructional modules of information available to learners as young as seven years old.[8] As this kind of work is extended, any youngster in any elementary school will have available to him storehouses of information on every known world culture that he is likely to want to study. Just as important, he will have access to this information at random. **That is, he can select the order in which he obtains modules of data, and he will become immensely more powerful in controlling his environment than is today's child.** Similarly, he will have available to him automated or self-regulating instructional systems of many kinds and will learn how to work with teachers in order to monitor his progress through areas where the essentials of his instruction are being mediated by technology.

The testing of the individually prescribed instruction programs at the University of Pittsburgh Research and Development Center and the Philadelphia Regional Laboratory (Research for Better Schools) is, I believe, among the most significant developments of our times. These centers are testing extensive programs for teaching most aspects of reading, arithmetic, and science entirely through self-instructional systems with embedded monitoring devices and training packages for professional and paraprofessional personnel. If we view this kind of development as a precursor of the systems of the future, the world of both teacher and learner is enormously changed. **Until very recently, a teacher who wished to individualize instruction was frequently hamstrung, because he could not even process the information about his students that is necessary to make wise decisions about individualizing instruction; the teacher's information burden was overwhelming. Now he will have not only support systems for information processing but also support systems of self-instructional materials that can be used as the prescriptions are made.**

It is in this realm, of course, that I tend to view the language-laboratory systems and the development of media-mediated instruction such as television and film; that is, I tend to see them as support systems. The concept of support systems is derived from our need to determine what is necessary in order to support any given kind of educational activity. For example, if we wish to create a self-regulating man-machine system that will teach foreign languages in a large metropolitan area, we can begin by asking what is needed to support the learning of foreign languages and make it self-regulating in that environment. We have done this kind of thinking in the past, but we have not looked at the needed supports in a sufficiently rigorous or realistic way. For example, we have more or less assumed that television could play certain kinds of roles, programmed instruction other roles, in-service training yet other roles, and so on. Now, we would make a model of our instructional system, looking at the kinds of pupil behavior we wished to promote and creating the matrices of support devices that would initiate learning, monitor it, and provide feedback to the learner and his teachers. Special subsystems would be created for the introduction of any content that is not ordinarily available through the classroom teacher, and other subsystems would provide opportunities for individual routes of development, some close to the mainstream and others idiosyncratic and far removed from it.

The concept of support systems has little utility, unless one considers supports and school organization simultaneously. For example, we have often intruded mass instruction by television in subject areas into self-contained classrooms, and we have had indifferent success (see, for example, Guba's excellent study of the MPATI system).[9] The fact is that the self-contained classroom is a poor organizational setting in which to take advantage of scheduled television programming. Self-contained-classroom teachers are accustomed to initiating and monitoring the learning that goes on. They are not oriented to taking advantage of support devices that play as prominent a role as has often been given to television, and they are aware that the children profit differentially from a televised program and are very critical

of it, even though their own teaching probably has a similar differential effect. It is possible, however, to conceive ways of organizing the school that will be better suited to instructional systems that have television components. Youngsters can go to a television center where special personnel who are trained to take advantage of the television instruction can link the television with other types of supports.

The support-systems concept is important because it makes it possible to think of the improvement of instruction in a way that is not tied to the existing supply of teachers, in which there is an enormous turnover. With technical support systems and concepts of differentiated roles for teachers, we are able to conceive of instructional systems that capitalize on teacher strengths and compensate for teacher weaknesses. This concept has great implications, also, for the setting of education. If we apply the concept of support systems and differentiated roles in instruction in various areas, we may find that we do not even need a school, in the ordinary sense of the word. Media-mediated instruction may be carried on at home or in public libraries and many other places, as long as we provide support in terms of monitoring capacity, that is, provide the learner and some other person in his environment with the capacity to tell what he is learning and to help adjust instruction and reshape it as information is forthcoming. In other words, we are simply no longer tied to the existing school buildings and constraints that operate in traditional educational environments.

It is interesting to see how young people are learning to use instructional systems without much help from us. For example, after a few lessons on the guitar from a live teacher, by taking advantage of the availability of televised lessons and self-instructional handbooks and using audio-tape recorders so that they can monitor their own progress, thousands of youngsters all over the country—possibly *hundreds* of thousands—are teaching themselves to play the guitar. They have even gone beyond this and learned how to make instruments such as the dulcimer, modify their own instruments, and invent new stringed instruments. With the aid of the electronic amplifier, they are able to create combinations of sounds that are virtually unique to them as individual performers. With a little effort, we can enable people to have the same kind of educational opportunity in many areas. The systematic development of new kinds of educational programs with systematic deployment of technical support systems and specially trained teachers will gradually replace our present pattern of education. We will look more closely at this feature below. First, let us give some attention to some of the more obvious unplanned changes that are taking place—trends due to concatenations of social forces.

The Breakdown of the City School Systems

The combinations of revolutions by youth, black people, poor people, pacifists, social egalitarians, and others are not responsible for the breakdown of the city school system. Under their impact, however, we can see how shaky it is and how little capacity many of the city school systems have for regenerating themselves. The large city school systems on the whole are weak and weak-willed, in the sense that they find it difficult to focus solidly on systematic programs of improvement. They feel impacted by pressure groups and strained in resources, and they are forced to cope with a devastatingly inadequate supply of personnel at all levels. Personnel supply worsens without artificial stimulation, since the large city school system is not an attractive place to many of our finest young teachers. Judging from the amount and quality of talent we need in the city schools and the amount and quality of talent we are getting, we must conclude that a great deal of talent is flowing elsewhere.

A resultant trend is that the school system is beginning, for self-protection, to act more and more like a corporate entity. By this, I do not mean that it is becoming more bureaucratized, for it has always been exceedingly bureaucratic. While the neighborhood school and the high school as single entities were formerly the basic organizational units, the basic units are now the entire district or the subdivisions into which it is broken. An example of this can be seen in the fact that the administration of a large eastern public school system is actually able to think of creating a large high school without one single building. The administrators are thinking of serving many of the children of the one city by using the resources of the city in many ways—by building self-instructional centers and by using media, museums, industries, libraries, and so on as centers for instruction. In other words, this city school system is beginning to react to its problems as a corporation does. Instead of putting energy at the individual level, it is beginning to put energy into large sections or segments of its problems. Similarly, New York City is finding that while individual school districts have great difficulty setting up community boards, subdistricts seem to have some success. I predict that it is at this subdistrict level that community boards will eventually become established and start to function. The individual school principal and his faculty are not strong enough to negotiate with a militant segment of the public, and they are unable to maintain

themselves as an institution when dissent becomes too great. The expenses of the new technology are another force that is driving the schools from central stations, and they are not systems that should be purchased for individual schools. **Proper use of television is far too expensive and has implications for far too many students to be centered in individual schools. Banks of televised courses can serve large numbers of students and increase the options available to them. Thus, the breakdown of the existing way of operating the city schools combines with the extraordinary expense of technology that serves larger rather than smaller numbers of students to encourage a more corporate mentality. This new approach is manifesting itself in some subtle but important ways.** School districts, such as Montgomery County, Maryland, for example, that have well over a hundred thousand students are operating career-development programs. They screen the young faculty members in the school system, bring them along into management positions, and provide training and seminars in management so that there is a continuous flow of qualified and well-trained personnel toward the upper echelons.

The corporate movement is not altogether a good thing, but I believe that in the long run the benefits will outweigh the disadvantages. Particularly, the opportunities in curriculum reform will be changed substantially. Until just recently, any curriculum change depended on changes generated simultaneously by hundreds of teachers working alone in their individual classrooms. If the teachers did not see the need for the change (as for theoretical mathematics instruction), it would not come about. If the teachers did not become enthusiastic about the change (foreign-language instruction, for example), it would not happen. **We are now going to see more corporate decisions with greater participation by the citizenry in the nature of these decisions (less autonomy, therefore, for the profession—at least for a while), but the decisions will be more likely to stick. It will be a difficult time for the teaching profession, but it may precede a time when the profession will bring far greater technical competence to its task—and it will need to, for citizens and students are going to scrutinize the school and participate in its operation far more than in the past.**

The Near Future and Its Implications for Instruction in Foreign Languages

We are moving toward planned social institutions, and the school is no exception. We are simply becoming unwilling to let the unthinking forces of circumstance shape the social environment in which we will exist. Gradually, educators are learning to think more systematically about the construction of educational institutions. Many kinds of schools will arise to replace the one or two kinds we have now. And the new schools will use several ways to help students. Some may be like the example that follows, which uses several curriculum modes.

Level One: A Self-Instructional Mode

In the skill areas and in the acquisition of basic information about the world and the society, the youngster is likely to teach himself through automated self-instructional systems, staffed by personnel trained to use those systems humanely and to accommodate efficiently the individual differences of learners. The instruction will take place in many settings. Part of it will take place at home; part may be in public institutions, such as libraries, that serve many people besides schoolchildren; and part may be in places where the youngster meets with adults, who help him evaluate what he is doing, help him choose routes that will be beneficial to him, and help provide him with support and a human environment that encourages him to continue in his study. Such a structure will not require everybody to go through all the steps in a curriculum. Some people will learn to read in the first year, when they are five or six years old. Others will not learn until they are adult, but the instruction will be available, the settings will be there. No longer will one have to maintain himself on the ladders of a school in order to continue his progress in the society.

Level Two: A Tutorial Mode

The second kind of instruction will be through tutors. The youngster will go somewhere, perhaps somewhere in the school, perhaps to some other place the way children go for piano lessons. He will meet with someone one, two, three, or four times a week who will help him develop programs of independent study to achieve competence, to satisfy his curiosity, or to do many other things. This activity will be supported by many types of self-instructional systems, but it will also be supported by libraries, dial-access systems, and the freedom to move about the environment gaining and analyzing information. The tutor's job will be to help the youngster remain motivated, help him define his interests and problems, and help him tailor his learning.

Level Three: A Scientific Mode

A third kind of instruction will be scientific inquiry. Working in small

groups, the learner will discover how to apply the modes of thinking of the scholarly disciplines. He will do this in the social sciences, the natural sciences, and mathematics; he will think about literature and how to analyze language; and he will do all this with his peers, with skilled group leaders as teachers, and with laboratory resources.

Level Four: A Mode of Dialogue and Reflection

A fourth kind of education will be accomplished as the youngster comes together with groups of his peers and wise and lively teachers to engage in dialogue over the nature and the future of the society. In groups, the children will, via media and directly, range over the course of human experience, trying to comprehend both the history of the race and the current scene, but learning most of all to engage in dialogue over the directions that human relations should take. The learner in this area of work will be in pursuit of no behavioral objectives that are set by other people. The criterion for success in this division of instruction will be to participate in the dialogue and to learn to subject one's opinion to the rigorous dissent of others.

This vision of the school means no physical school at all, but instruction that is suited to different purposes. Each curriculum mode requires different resources, different teacher roles, and different peer relationships. In the first mode, the learner works as an individual bettering himself, but along paths that are common to his fellows. In the second, he attempts to develop himself in his own terms. In the third, he learns, with his peers, the modes of inquiry of the disciplines and tries to apply them to reality. In the fourth, he engages in the essential debate over the course of human events and pursues the common quest for social meaning.

What are the implications of this view of the future for foreign-language instruction? While that is your question and not mine, I would like to toy with it a bit out of my inexperience in the hope that naive eyes may see some things that experienced eyes have learned not to see. In the first case, one might concentrate on the development of self-instructional systems that can function in the first curriculum mode mentioned above, where instruction is mediated by man-machine systems that are designed to be self-contained. One might concentrate on making languages available as support systems in the second mode, where the youngster who chooses to develop himself in that way can avail himself of those systems. One might choose to operate in the third mode and join with English teachers and linguistic scholars to create systems by which children can learn the scholarly modes for analyzing language and literature. One might attempt to enter the system in the fourth mode, using languages as the springboard for analyzing cultures, for looking at our cultural antecedents, for learning how we think and feel and how we can develop a wider view of mankind. In any of these four cases, the strategy would need to be significantly different. My own inclination would be to operate in the second and third modes. At the third mode I would plan a program with English teachers in which the study of culture, literature, and linguistics and the acquisition of language are engaged in as a scholarly study. Then I would try to complement this by building a support system that could function in the second mode, so that people who chose to attain competence of various kinds in different foreign languages could do so. **Foreign languages in the school could, in that way, function as a giant storehouse of opportunities for those who choose to pursue them. This last role has been very difficult for people interested in particular curriculum areas to adopt; the idea of being a support system has not seemed satisfying. However, we should be here as educators to learn how to give children greater options in their environment, to teach them how to control their environment more fully, rather than to seek ways of forcing our own particular area into prominence in the schools. It seems to me that in a combination of the second and third modes foreign languages have a marvelous opportunity. In the third mode they operate to improve the student's capacity to analyze his environment. In the second mode they can operate to help him acquire the skill to control more of his environment and to study it more effectively. I think I would be well content with those roles.**

Footnotes

[1] **Learned** and **Wood,** *The Student and His Knowledge; A Report to the Carnegie Foundation on the Results of the High School and College Examinations of 1928, 1930, and 1932,* Bulletin No. 29 (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1938).

[2] Textbooks in the social studies are illustrative in this regard. See, e.g., **Bruce R. Joyce,** *Strategies for Elementary Social Science Education* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965).

[3] See any work of general curricular or supervisory theory, e.g., **William B. Ragan,** *Modern Elementary School Curriculum* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

[4] **Jerome S. Bruner,** *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961).

[5] For guides to the literature, see **Bruce R. Joyce,** "Staff Utilization," *Review of Educational Research* (June 1967), 323-36; **Robert H. Anderson,** *Teaching in a World of Change* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966); **John I. Goodlad** and **Robert H. Anderson,** *The Nongraded Elementary School* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963).

[6] **Bruce R. Joyce,** *Man, Media, and Machines* (Washington: National Education Association, 1967).

[7] The current U.S. Office of Education program to develop new models for teacher education is partially designed to bring about this kind of change in teacher education. See, e.g., **Bruce R. Joyce,** *The Teacher-Innovator: A New Program for the Preparation of Teachers* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968).

[8] **Bruce R.** and **Elizabeth H. Joyce,** "Data Banks for Children: Development and Initial Studies," *Teachers College Record* (in press).

[9] **Egon G. Guba** and **Clinton A. Snyder,** "Instructional Television and the Classroom Teacher," *AV Communication Review,* 13 (Spring 1965), 5-26.

3

Trends in Two Elementary School Subject-Matter Areas

Social Studies
Language Arts

Social Studies

Everett T. Keach, Jr.
Professor of Social Science Education
Research and Development Center
University of Georgia

Scholar-Sympathizer
Sister Ruth Adelaide
Chairman, Modern Foreign Language Department
College of Mount Saint Joseph-on-the-Ohio

Practitioner
Gladys Lipton
Assistant Director of Foreign Languages
New York City Board of Education

A paper addressed to the topic "Trends in Elementary School Social Studies" must review the dialogue that has taken place since the 1950s in the field of social studies teaching. The 1950s witnessed a period of crisis in American education in general. The crisis was precipitated by the dissemination of information about the Soviet Union's achievements in several scientific fields—information that caused many to question the efficiency and relevance of our educational system. Sterling M. McMurrin, former United States Commissioner of Education, summed up the crisis in the following words:

> In education we are facing a crisis of conscience and collectively we are experiencing a sense of national guilt. This consciousness of guilt grows out of the realization that we have failed to establish and maintain an educational program of the quality of which we are capable and which is now essential to the well-being of all our people. We cannot deny that today we would command far more knowledge and have far more creativity, civic character, and national strength if our schools had been more rigorous in their intellectual discipline and had been more adequately structured to the needs of society.[1]

Scrutiny of the social studies curriculum, given impetus by the crisis, revealed a number of inadequacies. Investigators found a curriculum riddled with outdated and unrelated materials when compared with the contemporary life-styles of children, the present-day needs of society, and the current status of knowledge.

The *traditional* "expanding environment" theme, that is, presenting the child with information about the home, school, and neighborhood in the primary grades and following this with a treatment of the state, nation, and the world in the intermediate grades, failed to acknowledge some basic experiential differences between today's children and those of the early twentieth century. A research base exists to support the psychological validity for arranging a curriculum that, initially, explores the child's immediate environment. However, in the implementation of this curriculum, the schools tended to emphasize topics that were either too provincial for the student's interests and/or already understood by the student. The schools could not see that the student's world *was* the world. The child of the late twentieth century, constantly exposed to the impact of new and more efficient communications media, wanted to know more about man-man and man-land

relationships as they occur in places other than within the social confines of his family or the political confines of his neighborhood or community.

In terms of meeting the needs of society, the critics judged the curriculum to be outmoded. Analysis of the curriculum indicated that the schools were preparing students to live in a static society—one in which the important facts were already etched in stone, and which, when learned, would produce a person educated for "responsible citizenship." When one delineated the knowledge and skills necessary to engage in "responsible citizenship" activities in the twenty-first century, he arrived at an immediate conclusion that the present social studies curriculum must be modified. The uncertainty of the precise nature of tomorrow's problems cast strong suspicion upon the body of facts and skills being emphasized in the traditional curriculum. *The critics argued that in order to meet the needs of society, the student must be prepared to live in a world of change. Indeed, it appeared that the only constant existing in this world was the constant of change.*

Closely related to the problem of resolving what was worth learning in the social studies was the question of content suitability. The critics noted that two social science areas, history and geography, dominated the curriculum. They also noted that these two subject areas, sanctified by virtue of their tenure in the curriculum, had remained relatively untouched through the years. Thus, history was regarded by many teachers as a body of proven facts not subject to reinterpretation in the face of new data; and geography was regarded as an accounting of the physical and political features of the earth, with a liberal sprinkling of stereotyped descriptions of other peoples. The critics pointed out that the older social sciences were being reinterpreted as new information was recorded and that these new interpretations should be reflected in the social studies curriculum. It was becoming obvious to layman and scholar alike that social science areas such as anthropology, social psychology, and political science were accumulating knowledge and theories that would constitute invaluable sources for reconstructing the curriculum area charged with the development of "responsible citizenship." By now the time and effort invested in projects designed to overcome this curriculum lag is sufficient to warrant an examination of these projects as a partial step in identifying major trends in the field of elementary social studies.

The Introduction of New Content into the Curriculum

Elementary social studies in the 1970s will be characterized by concern for a conceptually oriented curriculum. For example, efforts at the University of Minnesota under the Project Social Studies grant program attempted to identify key concepts and generalizations from the social sciences and then to incorporate them in a K-12 curriculum in such a manner that they would serve as guides for the selection of the descriptive, factual materials to be used by the students. It is to be noted that the learning outcomes were couched not in terms of accumulating facts but rather in understanding key concepts and generalizations that are relevant in understanding man-man and man-land relationships.

At the University of Georgia, the Anthropology Curriculum Project endeavored to develop a curriculum for the elementary schools that would build an understanding of the structure of anthropology and also teach students the usefulness of anthropological concepts in looking at their local situation. Presently, a geographic education curriculum is under way at the University of Georgia that is designed to look at the basic concepts of the field of geography and how these are used to interpret and deal with man-land problems.

Although there is not general agreement on what content to place in the curriculum or at what age levels to introduce the content, preliminary evidence suggests that at the primary-school level one will see an increasing emphasis upon anthropology, with other disciplines playing a supporting role; at the intermediate-grade level, there will still be anthropological elements in the curriculum, but this discipline will play a supporting role to those of economics, history, and geography, as students examine selected regions of the world for intensive study.

Modification of the "Expanding Environment" Approach

The "expanding environment" approach to the teaching of social studies in the elementary school will predominate in most of the nation's schools in the 1970s. It will be modified, however, by a cross-cultural dimension that is now found primarily in the intermediate-grade curricula. At the primary level this cross-cultural dimension will involve children in studies of other families and communities throughout the world as they examine their own environment. Curriculum materials will include data on non-Western families and communities. The family and community studies will be used as vehicles to develop social science concepts and generalizations relating to culture, social process, and social organization. These resources will probably not be packaged

exclusively in texts; they will be prepared in other presentational forms such as filmstrips, film loops, and tape recordings. The study of social institutions in other cultures will be designed to sensitize the student to the universality of social processes and social instutions among men.

Another trend to be noted in elementary school social studies is the development of a curriculum with fewer topics for the child to study during any one school year. It is not unusual today to find curriculum guides outlining a social studies program for eleven- and twelve-year-olds that includes, among other topics, "A Study of the European Countries." This is sometimes followed with a listing of the countries to be presented to the students. A look at a world map will convince one that the student would have but a few days to "study" each country during the school year, even if he was participating in a twelve-month school year. Similarly, at the primary level, one can find social studies curricula that defy the energies of teachers to cover the materials before the sounding of the summer dismissal bell. Newer curricula reflect a concern for involving the student in the study of a few major topics during the school year so that he may have time to be introduced to data supporting the topic under examination and, then, to digest and synthesize these data. From these activities comes an understanding of the significance of the data and the ways they can be utilized in working with the social problems the student encounters. Thus, it is conceivable that the child will spend at least one full academic year in the study of two or three family systems drawn from different cultural contexts for comparison and contrast. Another year's study will be concerned with two or three communities from different cultures. At an intermediate-grade level, he may study three regions of the world in order to become familiar with the geographical and cultural phenomena that shape the perceptions of their people. Instructional materials will be designed to provide both cognitive and affective learning.

Recognition of the Kindergarten as an Integral Part of the Elementary School

Traditional kindergarten social studies programs have been concerned with the teaching of the basic social skills considered necessary for developing the individual's effectiveness for handling the relationships he encounters upon entering school. While these skills are important and will continue to be incorporated into new curricula, there is a trend toward including selected social science content at this level—content previously considered appropriate only for the older child. Wann, in a study of nursery and kindergarten children, observed: "It was evident that children repeatedly sought more and more information about a given topic and that they conscientiously tried to relate one bit of information against another. In this effort, the children employed the essential process of concept formation."[2] Spodek, in working with kindergarten children in the area of social studies, found that this age group is capable of developing social science concepts.[3] He also found that kindergarten children can use some of the tools of the social scientists in analyzing social situations.

Encouraged by these research findings, persons responsible for developing new curricula are providing the kindergarten with social studies programs that have a social science base. A research activity that will experiment with the place of the social sciences in the kindergarten is in process at the University of Georgia. Investigators in this project are working with three-, four-, and five-year-old children in an attempt to assess learning activities designed to lead to higher levels of cognitive achievement than previously thought possible.[4] Emphasis is upon both the acquisition of concepts from the social sciences and the development of thinking processes.

The trends identified in this paper have implied a social studies curriculum that will prepare a student to live in a world in which cultures are becoming increasingly interdependent. The curriculum of the 1970s will carefully limit the number of topics to be studied so that the student will have time to become thoroughly acquainted with representative cultures of the world, particularly for their significance to the development of his own country. Materials in the curriculum will be selected to assist the student to understand the significance of culture as a determinant of a people's values and beliefs. Emphases in the curriculum, relying heavily upon the social scientists' perspectives of the diversities and universalities found among cultures, will serve to prepare the student more adequately than in the past to become a responsible citizen motivated to work for a common cause—the cause of humanity.[5]

Footnotes

[1] **Sterling M. McMurrin,** "A Crisis of Conscience," in Paul Woodring and John Scanlon, eds., *American Education Today* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), 17.

[2] **Kenneth Wann, M. L. Dora,** and **E. A. Liddle,** *Fostering Intellectual Development in Young Children* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962), 19.

[3] **Bernard Spodek,** "Developing Social Science Concepts in the Kindergarten," *Social Education* (May 1963).

[4] **Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation,** *Third Annual Report* (Athens: University of Georgia, 1968).

[5] **Everett T. Keach,** "International Education in the Elementary Schools—Some Problems and Prospects," *The Social Studies* (Nov. 1968).

Language Arts

Ruth Strickland
Research Professor of Education
Indiana University

Scholar-Sympathizer
Virginia Garibaldi Allen
ACTFL FLES Committee
Former FLES Consultant to the Indiana Language Program

Practitioner
Virginia Gramer
Elementary School Foreign-Language Supervisor
Public Schools
Hinsdale, Illinois

Some fairly clear trends and a number of shifts in emphasis in the language-arts field stem from three major influences: (1) new insights provided by psycholinguists and others regarding what children do as they learn their language; (2) increased attention to living language and its use in the world outside the school; and (3) the work of some linguists. Possibly a fourth influence should be added—that of the psychologists concerned with cognitive development. Some of these trends and shifts in emphasis are evident in the professional literature in the field, if not in the schools. Others are in a state of confusion, thereby revealing the need for carefully devised longitudinal research.

Now, to give attention to the sources of influence. The first is the new information available about what children do as they learn their language. Note that this concerns *what* they do, not *how* they do it, because no theory of learning yet proposed seems to explain how children in the preschool years achieve their mastery of language. Nevertheless, several safe generalizations can be made about this learning process. Children put tremendous energy and concentration into the learning of language. Living in a world of talking people, they learn to talk. Part of what they learn, particularly vocabulary items, they learn by imitation, of course. But by the age of two-and-a-half or three they seem intuitively to sense some of the schemes that operate in the language. They develop their own sets of rules, test them with the sentences they hear, and abandon, modify, or elaborate their rules to fit what they hear. It is clearly a case of theory construction of an amazingly high order. Two examples will suffice to illustrate the point. Having sensed how adults form the plurals of nouns, the child not only adds /s/ in "books," /z/ in "boys," and /Gz/ in "wishes," but goes on to over-apply his newfound scheme to produce "deers," "foots," and "mouses." He notes the past-tense forms of verbs and produces "talked" with a /t/ sound, "played" with a /d/ sound, and "skated" with a /Gd/ sound, going on to such applications as "buyed," "breaked," "goed," and "runned" as well. But he does not add noun endings to verbs nor verb endings to nouns. He seems to sense word classes and handles them correctly, even as he tests out irregular verbs and comparatives and superlatives. In addition to this, Menyuk at MIT found children of age three using all the basic sentence structures used by adults without elaboration, of course, and with a minimum of vocabulary.[1]

Children's language behavior is, therefore, not entirely a product of imitation. Very early they begin to generate sentences that are not copies of adult sentences but clearly their own. Also, they invent new words to fit their needs. Leo Tolstoy called the attention of adults to this fact when he wrote, "The child realizes the laws of word formation better than you because no one so often thinks up new words as children."

Studies by Loban at the University of California in Berkeley, Bernstein in England, and Strickland at Indiana University offer new insights into the language of school-age children.[2] It is clear that without formal lessons, drill, and programming, they have learned to use all of the kinds of sentences found in adult speech, some children using them with great flexibility and awareness of conventions. This knowledge regarding what children have learned of language is ours to build on in the elementary school. Textbooks and recommended teaching methodology are only now beginning to reflect this.

At long last, teachers are being encouraged to look at language outside the school for guidance in apportioning their time and establishing their emphases. Since much of the most important work of the world is being done through face-to-face talk, oral language instruction is becoming more significant. In fact, someone has estimated that at least 70 percent of the earning power of every individual is closely related to his ability to talk and listen. Elementary teachers are being urged not only to legitimize talk in the classroom but actually to encourage and stimulate it. After all, if a teacher is to help a child to improve his language, to clarify and make effective his communication, and to discipline his speaking, listening, and thinking, there must be ample time for comfortable interaction. Teachers must hear enough child-talk to understand the language which the child brings to school and to determine what help he needs. Children's language is extremely revealing of their background and needs. The quality of a child's language portrays his home background, his vocabulary mirrors his experience, and the use he makes of communication indicates his attitude toward himself. The child's educational goal at the elementary level is to develop ease, clarity, suitability, and originality with language and recognition of its power in human interaction.

Recent textbooks for the elementary school give some attention to the nature of language, what it is, and how it operates. Children are helped to understand language as a man-made system that grows and changes to meet man's changing interests and needs. Material for this purpose is taken from several sources: direct factual presentations, literary selections, concrete experiences in and out of school. Direct factual presentation may entail vocabulary study and attention to the history of words as well as their pronunciation and meanings. In this connection children are taught what a dictionary is and what it is not—that it is a record of the words people use and what they do with them, not an arbiter of correctness. Children are encouraged to watch television and the newspapers for newly coined words designed to fit modern technology and space-age needs and to note the extent to which the new words are built of old, familiar parts. In literary selections from Mother Goose to King Arthur children find words that are obsolete or archaic or that have, through time, acquired multiple meanings.

A few of the newer textbooks are giving slight attention to some of the dialect differences in present-day English usage. Teachers make children aware of the variations in speech within the class or the school community and in dialects brought from other parts of the United States or the British Commonwealth. Children come to recognize what a dialect is and some of the reasons for the existence of varying dialects and to see them not as right or wrong but as natural and permissible differences. Social dialects present a different problem from dialects that are of regional or historical origin. Again, teachers are being urged to accept so-called substandard dialects sincerely and appreciatively and to help the child to add to his repertoire a dialect more widely accepted than his; it is a matter of addition, not modification. Loban in this country and Bernstein in England believe that a major problem of the child who speaks a substandard dialect is that he uses so small a portion of the potential of his language. Loban urges teachers to ask fewer "what" questions of children and more of the "Why do you think . . .?," "If this were true, then . . .?" types of questions, because they call for more thinking and more use of language. As children advance, language instruction must be related to their vocational interests.

Elementary teachers are being urged to help children listen both appreciatively and analytically; so much assails their ears nowadays that children learn to "turn off" listening, and they need help to use this skill critically. Through choral reading, dramatics, and role-playing, emphasis is placed on clear and effective communication. These activities also involve articulation, enunciation, pronunciation, voice quality, choice of words, and syntax.

The teaching of reading receives major attention in all elementary schools. While programs utilizing series of basal

readers are the norm, a number of school systems are exploring the possibilities of i/t/a (Initial Teaching Alphabet), linguistic approaches to reading, approaches based on the children's own language, programmed sequences, and a wide variety of phonics schemes. The isolating of the program of teaching reading from the rest of the language-arts program seems to many people an unfortunate trend. William S. Gray, on completion of his assignment to study reading and writing in the UNESCO countries, reported that the U.S. stood alone in divorcing reading from writing;[3] there appears little possibility that this situation will soon change.

The teaching of spelling is being modified to some extent by research being conducted mainly at Stanford University. Thousands of English words have been put through computer processing to analyze spelling patterns; analysis reveals that English spelling, looked at from the point of view of patterns of letter sequence, is far more regular than scholars realize. The new spelling textbooks do some grouping of words according to pattern, beginning with the most common consonant-vowel-consonant pattern. To what extent this work will prove practical in classroom teaching is not yet known.

The real impact of the work of linguists is in the realm of the teaching of grammar. The new textbooks are advertised as linguistically based, and someone who is called a "linguist" has been added to the production staff. The old grammar has in many instances been replaced by the concepts the authors have acquired of trans-formational grammar as espoused by Noam Chomsky. While Chomsky himself persistently says that what he is concerned with is a scientific study of language, not recommendations for teaching, a few people are attempting to fit into programs their recently acquired (and at times seriously undigested and poorly absorbed) knowledge of this "new" grammar. While a number of linguists are happy to see elementary school curriculum experts turn their attention to this material, some of the more discerning of them are now calling much of what has appeared "premature, ill-conceived, unsuitable, and actually a disservice to language teaching." Whereas in the field of modern mathematics ten years of solid research preceded the appearance of any textbooks incorporating the "new" mathematics, in the field of language teaching the opportunists appear to have taken over. *What is most needed now is action research by teachers in the classroom and a great deal of it. But before the schools turn to action research they must center their attention on children, not on the pressures of authors and publishers.*

Children love language. As they learned their language in their early years they developed competencies that we should by all means utilize. Children paid attention, intuitively, to the way language operated in their own little language environment. They mastered the phonology of their language by the age of four and its grammar by the age of eight. They did it without drill on sounds or careful programming or filling in deadly blanks in workbooks. They listened to people who talked, then imitated, even in their early jabbering, the melody and rhythm of the language. They learned the common vocabulary needed in daily living through hearing it used consistently and repetitively by the people who lived together in that environment. They sensed rules of operation (as in forming of plurals, past tenses, and the like) and tested them out, modifying and adapting them to the language they heard. They learned to string words together in sequences, sentences, as the people around them did it. What the child did was not completely imitation—it was imitation adapted and colored by what was going on in the child's mind as he experimented and played with language. Even at the age of two, both his playtime and before-sleep monologues showed his interest in individual, unstructured, and certainly self-motivated practice. His obvious satisfaction when his utterances served his purposes proved his interest in linguistic growth and achievement.

Some of what the linguists have offered is suitable for children if the way it is utilized makes sense in the light of what we know about the way children learned their language. Since Loban's and Strickland's studies indicated that children at age six are utilizing expanded and elaborated sentences, we can start from there. Teachers can take a sentence a child has used, such as, "Mother baked a cake," and they can build a wide variety of sentences using this model sentence. They can expand the pattern by adding elements of time, place, manner, cause, and the like. Children enjoy playing with sentences, tossing them together in all sorts of ways, and noting changes in emphasis and meaning.

In the course of this, the terminology of grammar can be used as it fits—"What other verb would make our meaning clearer?", "Can we use other adjectives to make the picture more vivid?", "The subject of this sentence is a long one—'My married sister who lives in Detroit came to visit us.' " Some of the newer terminology is useful if one cares to use it. "Noun phrase" and "verb phrase" are easy to understand; "determiner" may mean more to children than "article," and so forth. But

terminology is a means to an end, not an end in itself; it is not what a child knows about language but rather what he does with it that will influence his life.

Children enjoy exploring the means, other than words and sequences of words, through which we communicate. Testing the meaning communicated through the application of pitch and stress to each of the words in a question like "What are you doing?" always holds children's interest. Playing with language, teachers find, can pay high dividends, whereas abstracting and drilling may serve only to decrease children's zest for language practice. It is not the practice children seem to dislike so much as the fact that much of it is divorced from the realities of their lives.

Many leaders in the field of the language arts are persistently calling teachers' attention to the necessity for steeping children in good literature as part of the language program. How else can children be made aware of what is good than by being constantly exposed to the best there is in the language? This does not mean their hunting through a delightful poem for subjects and predicates and the number of sentences in a stanza. It is, rather, a matter of enjoying the rhythm and cadence, the happy choice of words, the mental pictures, and the emotional response the poem or story evokes. Literature should be listened to above all, listened to as the teacher reads it and reads it well.

Sometimes literature will lead to writing that is the child's own creative expression. This writing is not for correcting errors but for enjoying if the writer wishes to share it. *The teaching of writing form and the mechanics of the skill is done through records and reports in the content subjects, not through personal creative writing.* Teachers in England give far less attention to "correctness" in children's writing than American teachers and far more attention to the expression of what a child has inside that he wants to bring out. The thinking and feeling aspects of the writing are considered more important than neatness, careful handwriting, and correct spelling and punctuation.

The language-arts field is in transition, a transition accompanied by some confusion of values. Some educators are pushing in the direction of more and more prescription, more "learning about" and less learning through experience; others are recommending that teachers select from what is offered all that they can use to help children become masters of their language. All educators want to help children use language clearly, comfortably, and confidently in every situation that calls for communication through language.

Footnotes

[1] **Paula Menyub,** "Syntactic Structures in the Language of Children," *Child Development,* 34 (1963), 407-22.

[2] **Walter D. Loban,** *The Language of Elementary School Children* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963); **Basil Bernstein,** "Social Class and Linguistic Developments," in *Education, Economy and Society* (Glencoe, N.Y.: Free Press, 1961); **Ruth G. Strickland,** *The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children* (Bloomington, Ind.: School of Education, Indiana University, 1962).

[3] **William S. Gray,** *The Teaching of Reading and Writing* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1956).

4

Goals and Trends of Administration, Organization, and Supervision in Elementary Education

Jack E. Kittell
Professor of Education
University of Washington
Member, Tri-University Project
University of Nebraska

Scholar-Sympathizer
Frank Otto
Professor of Foreign Language Education
The Ohio State University, Columbus

Practitioner
Ralph W. Bassett
Foreign Language Consultant
Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

Although "administration" was the topic assigned for this paper, the writer has taken the liberty of using a title reflecting three areas of major responsibility of the elementary school administrator. Administration, organization, and supervision are the components of administration in elementary education, and they serve as the basic units of this paper.

Administration of Elementary Education

It is not uncommon for administration in elementary education to be interpreted as the principalship of elementary schools. While such an interpretation is, of course, important, the role of central office administration cannot be overlooked. The principalship is, in the final analysis, a "middle management" position, and the influences from above and below its line position deserve careful consideration.

School District Administration

Goals. It is safe to say that the generally accepted goals of educational administration have changed little in the last thirty-five years. Most administrators would agree that their role is to facilitate the realization of the purposes of the organization they administer. Most would agree that the basic organizational purpose is teaching and learning.[1] When one poses the question, "Teaching and learning for what?" considerably less agreement becomes evident.

The most frequently expressed goals of teaching and learning are: (1) to educate for constructive citizenship; (2) to assure continuity of the culture; (3) to reflect the wishes of the society; and (4) to lead the way in new directions that society might take. Most educational organizations subscribe to all of the above, but the extent to which each is subscribed varies greatly among school districts. The local interpretations vary even more—from directives designating the acceptable fashion of male hairstyling and strict library censorship to a permissiveness approaching England's Summerhill.

Some readily discernible trends in organizational goal emphasis include acceptance of definitions with less freedom of interpretation such as: (1) providing equality of educational opportunity, regardless of race, religion, or wealth; and (2) equipping the young with the abilities necessary for coping with rapid change, mass media, and intercultural relationships.

Because of U.S. Supreme Court decisions concerning integration and prayer in the schools,[2] because of a flood

of federal monies earmarked for specific purposes, and because, as Archibald MacLeish has so succinctly stated, "A curious automatism, human in origin but not human in action, seemed to be taking over,"[3] more and more goals of teaching and learning have been interpreted *for*, rather than *by*, educators. **In 1932 George Counts challenged educators with the query: "Dare the school build a new social order?" Today educators dare not ignore the building of a new social order.**

Consolidation and Decentralization. Another effect upon school district administration is the increasing size of school districts in general. Viewed nationally this trend is created by the consolidation of thousands of tiny schools into larger, more efficient districts.[4] At the same time, however, there is increasing concern about the unwieldiness, poor communication, and insensitivity to personal needs characteristic of large school districts. Thus, both the analyses of metropolitan school boards and the demands of community groups, particularly educationally disadvantaged minorities, indicate the necessity to decentralize administration in highly concentrated population areas.[5] The nature and degree of actual decentralization is varied, reflecting the variety of purposes and amounts of pressure and need that exist from district to district. Most of the large metropolitan districts are in the process of effecting some type of decentralization; there is little doubt that this is a real trend constituting one means of achieving effective communication between administration and the people. Decentralization is of particular importance to accurate feedback, an essential component in communication.

Some of the forms decentralization might take are interesting as possible previews of future practices. *Certainly, in general, the local community or neighborhood will have more say in determining its educational life. And in some situations the local community or neighborhood educational unit may become almost autonomous.*[6] **Public school districts are also showing some signs of opening their traditionally closed system and inviting other community institutions to share the responsibility for quality education.**[7] Some school boards have contracted with colleges and universities and/or large knowledge industries to assume large amounts of the masterminding and guidance of the operation of their school districts.[8]

District Organization. The school district itself may assume new and different shapes. A large metropolitan district may provide an umbrella for special subsystems organized to meet, among other problems, the sometimes conflicting demands of Black Power advocates, integrationists, and other environmental pressures;[9] there may be a division of a large metropolitan district into several small sections, each of which would consolidate with its adjacent suburban school district to provide more heterogeneity and integration for both;[10] metropolitan districts may reorganize into educational parks, each servicing all or most levels of schooling.[11]

Finance. Administrators of school districts have faced increasing financial problems, finding it more and more difficult to meet their needs from local sources,[12] and although outside sources, particularly the federal government, have yielded a relatively large flow, it has been sporadic, late, uncertain, earmarked, and extremely sensitive to large expenditures in other areas, such as the war in Vietnam, which threatens to diminish drastically the flow or perhaps even eliminate it altogether.[13] Since much of the outside funding has been allocated for operational expenditures only, rather than capital outlay, any large cutbacks directly and immediately affect the educational program. *At best, the manner and nature of outside funding have rendered long-range educational planning extremely difficult. Outside funding has also served to point up the tremendous importance of purpose-defining and decision-making as crucial tasks of administrators, who must determine priorities, modify or eliminate programs, and improvise to keep the organization viable.*

It is on the vital processes of purpose-defining, decision-making, and communication as means of serving the organization, as well as the nature of organization itself, that emphasis is currently placed in the training of administrators and in administration research.[14] We do not know how unique educational administration is when compared to administration of other large organizations; sufficient similarities do exist to justify considerable attention to public and business administration. Further, some attention should be given to the social and behavioral sciences in preparing tomorrow's school superintendents and principals.[15]

Personnel. A final area of extreme importance in school district administration is that of personnel. It has not been uncommon in large school districts for the selection of personnel, both certificated and noncertificated, to be handled almost exclusively by the central administrative office. Until recently, personnel relationships were such that superintendents who managed reasonably well in human relations were able to maintain a relatively "middle" position between school personnel and the school board by fostering a paternalistic image with personnel and a professional adviser image with the board. But times have changed:

(1) teachers have become impatient and militant; (2) specialists have become more and more necessary to the superintendent in decision-making; and (3) teacher demands and federal funds have caused entry of a flood of paraprofessionals into public education.

Teacher militancy has resulted in legal negotiation rights for teachers that in turn have necessitated new interpretations of the superintendent's image and role. The American Association of School Administrators has recommended that the superintendent remain the man essentially in the middle (an independent third part) and not allow his position to become an integral part of the school board.[16] Legal provisions for negotiations appear to be forcing a separation of administrators from teacher organizations.[17] It would seem almost inevitable that in spite of the AASA recommendation, the ultimate general effect of negotiation activity will for all practical purposes place the superintendent on the side of the school board; that is probably where the teacher's image will place him whether he wants such an alignment or not. In the heat and turmoil of militant negotiation, neutrality is not usually recognized. The superintendent will play an increasingly important and active part in negotiations whether as independent third party or as professional spokesman for the school board, and the techniques of negotiation must become an integral part of his administrative skill.

The selection of appropriate personnel becomes more complex as the demands for specialization, aides, and new patterns of staff utilization increase and become more insistent. *As specialization of role increases and as team teaching and other patterns of staff deployment become more prevalent, the difficulty of acquiring specifically needed faculty additions and replacements will make the distances between the district personnel office and the individual classroom too remote.* The increasing numbers of paraprofessionals, who represent a wide range of educational attainment, usable skills, and ages, pose another problem.[18] Matching professional needs, teacher demands, talents, and budget allowances is not a simple task, nor is providing the training of aides and of teachers in using and supervising them. *Because of their relatively recent appearance in most states, the roles of paraprofessionals in public education have not been legally defined.*[19] *Nor have their relationships to professionals and children been described—whether they are volunteer or paid, full- or part-time aides.*[20]

The implications of these administrative facets for elementary education are tremendous. If education becomes, as it must, a lifelong activity and the responsibility and participation of all segments of society, the elementary school may be freed from its tightly bounded cell in the rigid, traditionally closed system. Individualization of instruction will become a necessity rather than a theoretical goal. Educational life will deal in, rather than ignore or conceal, reality. And each child's needs and potentialities rather than next year's curriculum requirements will determine his educational experiences.

Elementary School Administration

While there is no doubt about the importance of school district administration on public school education in general policy-making, organizing, and financing, it is at the individual school level that policy is actually translated into educational experiences. It is not unknown for such experiences to be considerably different from what district policy would lead one to believe they should be. The very possibility of such differences between policy and practice speaks to the importance of elementary school administration. Some of the trends noted in the foregoing section may increase or decrease that importance.

Status and Policy-Making. **The elementary school principal as a professional is, in general, committed to support the best possible total educational program, but his "most important job is the maintenance and furtherance of the instructional program"[21] in the school for which he is principal.** Traditionally the elementary school principal has been both a *line* and *staff* officer, and many of his problems stem from difficulty in keeping the two functions separate. Elementary school principals have gone on record for the last twenty years declaring that it would be ideal if approximately 40 percent of their time could be used for supervision and 24 percent for administration.[22] In reality, however, the two functions balance out at about 30 percent each. In general, these principals consider lack of clerical and administrative help and central office demands to be the major hindrances to attaining the ideal use of their time.[23]

Approximately half of all elementary school principals believe that the administrators of their districts consider them as leaders, 42 percent believe that they are considered supporters, and the remainder believe that they are considered followers. *Only 27 percent report that they are invited to participate in the development of school system policies.* In general, the larger the school system in pupil enrollment, the less likely that the elementary school principal will be invited to participate.[24]

The trend of large metropolitan school districts to decentralize in some situations, particularly those in which individual schools or clusters of schools become semi-autonomous subsystems, may result in more active leadership of principals in policy-making. In some cases, however, the principal will find that his status changes very little; only the policy-makers will have changed; a college department, a business or neighborhood group, or combinations of these will replace the central office. He may lose some freedom of leadership enjoyed under more professional authority. (It will probably be noticed that male pronouns are used in reference to principals. This reflects the more than 50 percent decrease in women elementary school principals since 1928, leaving the position predominantly male —78 percent.)[25]

Finance. Budget preparation is another aspect of policy-making in which principals have relatively little power. Approximately a third of all principals have nothing to do with budget preparation, and less than one fourth plan, recommmend, and defend. The remaining 40-plus percent make recommendations only. A trend, though not clear-cut, has been for greater participation by principals in the preparation of the budget—another instance of a trend for central district administration to seek specialized aid in decision-making; however, the larger the school district, the less the participation.[26]

Personnel. **The elementary school principal's personnel relationships have long been the most complex, contradictory, and crucial of his "leadership" functions. It is in this area that the distinction between administration (line) and supervision (staff) functions must be clear—not only to the principal but to his faculty as well. In the process of human interaction, belief may be more important than reality.**

The key to the importance of the elementary school principalship as a leadership role in the future probably lies in the area of personnel relationships. Therefore, personnel selection, the utilization of personnel, personnel evaluation, and negotiations must be considered carefully in a discussion of the principal.

An indication of the principal's reputed importance in personnel relationships has been the maxim, "As the principal, so goes the school." Recent research tends to support the maxim.[27] Two assumptions can thus be made: (1) the actual manner and amount of district policy implementation depends in large part on the principal and his relationship with instructional personnel; and (2) if the elementary school principal is the key to school climate and productivity, it would seem logical that the principal be an active participant in the selection of his faculty. According to a recent survey,[28] elementary principals have gained some authority in the selection of teachers since 1958. Nevertheless, in 1968 almost 40 percent had nothing to say about the selection of teachers. About one third could accept or reject from several teacher candidates selected by the central office, one fourth could examine and recommend teachers, and close to 4 percent employed teachers directly.[29]

With what appears to be a general trend toward specialization in the elementary school[30] and as team teaching (now relatively little used)[31] spreads with some accompanying specialization, the importance of maintaining appropriate faculty compositions increases. Certainly the person responsible for effectively orchestrating for quality production a group of professionals should actively participate in their initial selection for membership in the group. To a great extent, efficiency, productiveness, climate, and success of an individual school depend directly upon the "match" of individual professional personnel and the existing factors of community, pupils, faculty group, aides, principal, and the climate to which they all contribute. The entire theory of planned interschool and intraschool grouping of human beings (pupils, faculty, and special-service personnel) to accomplish desirable objectives can be rendered ineffectual by indiscriminate misassignment of teachers.[32]

A further complication is the increasing number of paraprofessionals involved in elementary education.[33] The selection, orientation, training, assignment, and evaluation of teacher aides must, for a variety of reasons, take place within the jurisdiction of the principal. As has been discovered in assigning student teachers, all faculty members are neither capable nor desirous of supervising a subordinate adult. Many do, however, desire and deserve reasonable aid, and to deny them the right to differ individually from a mythical norm is to be unrealistic, particularly when such differences may constitute an asset in their teaching.

Such relative newcomers to educational practice as educational television, audio-visual laboratories, programmed and computer-assisted instruction, systems analysis, flexible scheduling, team teaching, and other patterns of staff grouping have placed entirely new demands upon the school principal. It should be pointed out that none of the innovations listed above has by any stretch of the imagination permeated most elementary schools. In fact, no one of them has been adopted by more than a rather small minority of all schools. Together they represent a somewhat greater spread of influence—

but still far from a dominant majority. And they probably will not be widespread until the long habit of staff deployment for administrative convenience is broken. It will probably not happen immediately, but inevitably most schools will accept new and flexible patterns of staff utilization; the role of the principal will of necessity, become a more dynamic one, assuming, of course, that the principalship as such still exists.

Perhaps that aspect of personnel administration found to be most "touchy" by elementary school principals is personnel evaluation. At best, any honest evaluation of one human being by another, particularly a peer, is always fraught with latent emotional reactions. Any confrontation of the ego risks crippling emotional reactions, and probably only to the extent that such confrontations are honestly and objectively based on, shaped by, performed, and accepted with reason will the desired benefits of evaluation outweigh the detriments of emotional reaction. It is for this and other reasons that objective self-evaluation is the highly desired but rarely achieved ideal. Since most principals work in a very real world, they must assume responsibility for evaluating personnel,[34] and too often reason has had little to do with the situation in which it must be done. **To date, a great wealth of research data has failed to identify with certainty those characteristics by which all teachers can be accurately, validly, and reliably evaluated. Some characteristics that might be effective if used with particular situations are usually identified, but no useful taxonomy of situations has been developed.** Thus we find principals attempting to evaluate with fuzzy criteria or attempting to interpret both criteria and situations and losing, in either case, the objectivity that makes ratings reliable and valid. For the central office to select personnel whose characteristics a principal's school situation does not need or cannot cope with and then expect the principal to confirm, through evaluation, the mismatching after a year or more of ineffectiveness and bruised ego seems to be wanton waste of human resources, an unfair game to play with principals, and a flight from reason. *A principal who is offered and accepts a large amount of responsibility for the selection of personnel with whom he will work also accepts a commitment to accomplish as much as possible for his educational program through his selection and to be responsible for bringing to full effectiveness the personnel he chooses as real investments in human resources.* This differs considerably from the "trial-and-error-reject approach" that is sometimes used with new teachers year after year. When discarding should but does not take place, the entire problem is shifted to elementary schoolchildren, who are too young to organize in protest.

Another problem in personnel evaluation centers in the principal's dual roles of "impersonal" evaluator on the one hand and trusted consultant-supervisor on the other. Often, through no fault of his own, the principal is placed in the contradictory roles of disciplinarian and confidant. While it is important for principals to make clear distinctions between the two functions, it is probably even more important that those who are evaluated recognize such a distinction. The conflict between the two roles is probably responsible for the not infrequent instances in which neither role is effectively served.

A more recent personnel problem confronting elementary school principals derives from teacher militancy and teachers' spreading legal rights of negotiation. The current struggle to attain legal negotiative power by teachers is resulting in new professional divisions— teachers representing one body with negotiation rights and the school board representing the body of authority with which negotiations are conducted. Currently, administrators are in most cases without a legally recognized organization with negotiation rights. While superintendents debate whether to join the school board or remain in the middle, the elementary school principal has been deprived of even that choice; he *is* the man in the middle—like it or not. More disconcerting, he is generally without rights of participation.[35] Since he finds himself excluded from teachers' associations, he obviously cannot play on their team. Since he is somewhat limited in administrative powers of policy-making, budget preparation, and personnel selection and all too visible in his required and unpleasant role of evaluator, he appears to teachers to be the central administration's man and is therefore placed in the school board camp—particularly when the heat of bargaining reaches the point where neutrality is no longer recognized by teachers as a valid position. **The resulting paradoxes are apparent: (1) teachers hold their principal accountable for whatever policies the school board gained through negotiation, although he shared no responsibility for formulating such policies; (2) teachers expect the principal to sympathize with their negotiated gains, many of which alter drastically his own practices, although he has had no voice in making the changes; and (3) both teachers and central administration expect the principal to exert responsible leadership in implementing negotiation agreements, even though he was considered neither responsible nor important enough to be a participant in negotiating. The final solutions to these**

paradoxes may determine the real importance of the elementary school principalship of the future.

Unless the principal is accorded participant representation in negotiations as a middle-management coordinator who is depended upon for his knowledge of elementary education, his expertise in clarifying and enhancing the communication process, and his skill in sensitively orchestrating human interaction for effective education, it is likely that his position will deteriorate into that of a subforeman in charge of buildings, grounds, toilets, and petty cash. It seems highly unlikely that an educational organization, regardless of its future shape, can afford to ignore the tremendous potential that the principalship position or its equivalent represents. The immediate future, however, will be painful for the elementary school principal, and considerable soul-searching will undoubtedly take place.

Elementary School Organization

The term *organization* is currently used in education in two ways. One use refers to the nature of a human system with the purpose of attaining a goal important to its members and possessing formal, institutional, and personality characteristics;[36] the other refers to "patterns of deploying pupils, teachers, or other organizational components . . . in order to achieve some specified organizational goals."[37] The latter is the concern of this section, in which only a brief summary and analysis of the recent flurry of literature about the various aspects of this topic can be attempted.[38]

A brief review of history leaves the impression that the organization of elementary schools has moved through three distinct phases: (1) one-room-school-type, multi-age groupings; (2) graded schools; and (3) nongrading or ungraded graded schools. In fact, there is a persistent feeling that organizational patterns have gone almost full circle, and in the aspect of gradedness this is true. However, the schools and society within which these patterns must now function are considerably different from those prior to Quincy's first graded organization in 1848.

The history of school organization is not so simple as the three phases of gradedness imply. Even in the 1870s, as gradedness began to spread throughout public education in the United States, educators were concerned about how it might affect individualization of instruction;[39] the same type of concern supports the current interest in nongrading. Shane briefly describes thirty-two "Historically Interesting and Educationally Promising Plans" for grouping pupils in the elementary school,[40] and in so doing presents evidence of the ferment of interest in approaching individualization of instruction through organization.

Goodlad and Rehage have helped to clarify some of the issues of organization by classifying the functions of organizations as *vertical* or *horizontal*.[41] The function of classifying pupils for progression through a sequence of experiences is accomplished by *vertical* organization; the function of dividing pupils among available teachers is accomplished through *horizontal* organization. Although the two categories may serve little purpose in devising educational programs that integrate all aspects of a child's school, they do offer a convenient way of talking about the goals and trends of elementary school organization and are used here for that purpose.

Vertical Organization

It may be too soon to speculate about a society so aware and so devoted to lifelong education that all its segments cooperatively serve educational functions and recognize and exploit tacit learning to the extent that sequence of educational experience becomes a more complex concept. Until mosaic, nonlinear patterns of simultaneity as well as linear sequences of educational experiences are better understood, it is probably easier to discuss the linear sequential provisions of organization.

School Divisions. Before concentrating on elementary schools alone, it is important to survey the forms of sequential organization represented by the divisions of schools. Originally, admission to public schools in the United States depended upon being able to read, and the average entrance age was around eight. In several states today compulsory attendance legally begins at age seven or eight. It was common until the turn of this century for elementary schools to include eight to ten grades and be terminal for a majority of students.[42] For those relatively few who continued, there were two to four years of high school. Gradually two basic patterns became prevalent, 6-6 or 8-4. Early in the century evidence of the unique problems of pubescence and early adolescence was sufficient, along with a movement to begin the high school program earlier and a desire to protect the years of childhood, for some school districts to reorganize with "middle" or "intermediate schools" that were almost all to become known as junior high schools. This form of organization spread until at present slightly more than 50 percent of the nation's school districts have established separate junior high schools. The patterns of organization then became 6-3-3, 6-6, or 8-4.

There is now considerable discussion and debate about reorganizing the

intermediate school under the name of "middle school,"[43] ostensibly to realize better the original aims that some claim were not attained by the junior high school, which too often became a lower extension of the senior high school, failing to serve the unique needs of pre-adolescence. Rapidly accumulating evidence of earlier physical, mental, and social maturation has led to proposals for the new middle school to begin with the fifth or sixth grade and end with the eighth grade. Although there has been considerable resistance by junior high school personnel, some large school districts have moved to some form of the middle school, and at least forty-five states have one or more middle schools.[44] It should be pointed out, however, that not all moves to the new middle schools are based directly on the unique needs of pre-adolescence. In fact, at least two other reasons can be identified:[45] (1) such reorganization serves to meet pressing space shortages; and (2) the middle school offers a means of retaining neighborhood primary schools and at the same time provides for racial integration earlier than the traditional seventh-through-ninth-grade junior high school.

For a variety of reasons, then, the middle school has received increasing attention in professional literature. It has received some implementation and will receive more in the future but may not represent anything like a majority of schools for quite some time, if ever. Some believe that those schools moving to new middle-school divisions are tending to shift from 4-4 to 5-3-4 patterns of school-grade-age divisions.[46]

Considerable organizational activity is also taking place at the beginning of the elementary sequence. Although the first public school kindergartens in the United States were established in St. Louis in 1876 and educationists for many years have generally accepted the values of kindergarten, it is interesting to note that in 1968 nineteen states provided no financial aid for kindergartens, and only twenty-five states supported kindergartens on the same basis as grades one through twelve.[47]

For prekindergarten education several types of school organizations have evolved. The earliest nursery schools were most prevalent in private schools in large metropolitan areas in the eastern part of the United States. Later, municipal and state governments assumed the responsibility for regulating such schools to protect children; part of this responsibility grew out of provisions for "day care" centers that enabled mothers in "needy" families to work while their preschool children were cared for in quasi-educational programs. In 1964 the Economic Opportunity Act provided a new focus on early childhood education in this country. Since then millions of preschool children have been enrolled in Head Start programs.

As at the middle-school level, nursery or preschool education is a center of controversy between two schools of thought, whose members can, with some oversimplification, be labeled the cognitionists and the traditionalists. The controversy rages over how and for what nursery school education should be provided.[48]

The most important aspect of the controversy is the general agreement of both factions that there should be a continuous public school program serving ages three through eight.[49] Some proposals have advocated educational programs for two-year-olds and younger children.[50] If nursery schools become an accepted part of public education, which they are not as yet,[51] the implications for all aspects of the regular elementary schools of the future are considerable. An emphasis on early childhood education will be meaningless if appropriate changes for effective follow-through are not made in the existing programs of grades one to five.[52]

Intra-School Organization. Equal to that directed to new patterns of school divisions has been the recent current interest in vertical organization within the schools. The three basic forms of organizing for sequential progress within schools are (1) the graded school with single-grade units, (2) the graded school with multigrade units, and (3) the nongraded school.

The graded school with single-grade units has been the prevalent pattern of vertical organization of almost all but very small rural schools for more than a half-century. The greatest attractions of the single-grade unit were its ostensibly logical and simple form of organization and its administrative convenience. Although perceptive educators were concerned from its inception with its failure to provide for individualization of instruction, gradedness became the established pattern throughout the nation. School buildings, equipment, instructional material, and teacher-training were made to conform to the pattern.

Many of the patterns of grouping described by Shane[53] were attempts to compensate for the graded organization, but many were horizontal in nature and less than fully effective in meeting the needs for continuous progress. Two recent movements to effect vertical reorganization are graded schools with multigrade units and nongraded schools.

The basic principle of the graded school with multigrade units has been represented in the establishment of small rural one-room schools in which children of all elementary school grades met together in one room. The individual differences within the group were quite

visible if for no other reason than extreme contrast. The principle of multigrading has been recently revived in proposals to group together pupils of several grades. One of the purposes claimed to be served is breaking the almost unconscious graded attitude of teachers who tend to ignore the great range of differences among their pupils and to consider them as third graders or fifth graders, and so on. When deliberate mixes are effected, a teacher cannot easily ignore pupil differences, because the differences are now represented by terms in which the graded teacher thinks—"grades." *One weakness of multigraded organization, which may explain why teachers have sought homogeneous grouping, is too much divergence in ability and achievement for one teacher to manage.* It should be mentioned that recent multigrading proposals differ from the one-room variety in the much greater amount of deliberate selection and planning that larger, modern schools allow. *Another weakness may be the retention of gradedness as a basic concept; that is, to continue a mix of pupils from different grades, one must retain grades.*

The relatively recent emphasis in professional literature and in experimentation has been more on nongrading than on multigrading. *Nongrading is the current label for attempts to provide for the continuous progress of each individual pupil through a meaningful sequence of educational experiences.* Among the advantages attributed to nongrading[54] are the claims that it (1) breaks the habit of graded thinking, (2) provides a nonrepetitive continuity of educational experiences, (3) approaches true individualization of instruction, and (4) reduces interpupil competition. As with any promising innovation, more is claimed for it than is really warranted. Some alleged advantages might be questioned as to their value and possible attainment (e.g., elimination of competition). **Many other advantages cannot be claimed as unique to nongrading. Its greatest potential strengths may be its effects on teachers' attitudes toward gradedness and improvement in the continuity of educational experiences—a step closer to real continuous progress.**

It would be difficult for even a casual observer to ignore the increasing amount of discussion or experimentation with nongrading. It has constituted one of the favorite projects for which school districts have sought federal funds. It has been the topic of several recent books[55] and literally hundreds of articles and is increasingly reported to have been adopted by schools and school districts. Typical of innovations in education, however, there seems to be more sound and fury than substantive change. This is true in two ways:

(1) One may be led to believe that nongrading has become or will soon become the predominant type of elementary school organization, but according to a recent survey,[56] in the 1967-68 school year only about one fourth of all U.S. elementary school principals had had experiences with nongraded primary schools and only 17 percent with nongraded upper levels. Only slightly more than half of those with experience in primary nongradedness felt certain of its value, and only 35 percent were convinced of its value at upper levels.

(2) **Upon close inspection, one is apt to discover that what is called nongrading is merely the same old practice under a new label or a mere substitution of rigid levels for rigid grades.**[57]

While individual continuous progress is desirable in all areas of the curriculum, it is usually agreed that the subject areas of reading and mathematics are sufficiently developmental in nature to necessitate planned sequences of levels in a nongraded organization. In practice, however, school after school establishes sequences of levels in reading only. Such a practice is perhaps no better than, if as effective as, many other forms of grouping by other labels. It is almost certain that more and more schools will report changes to nongraded organization in the foreseeable future. Also, it seems relatively safe to predict that as nongradedness becomes more common it will eventually be replaced by some other term, perhaps "continuous progress."

To date, the research concerning the relative effectiveness of the nongraded organization has been typically inconclusive.[58] *This is perhaps to be expected, because of a failure to separate behavioristic and phenomenalistic factors.* Nongradedness as a form of organizational structure is but one of many factors affecting the academic achievement or attitudes of children in the school. In most research studies little is done about controlling the effects of other factors or for that matter defining the differences between experimental nongrading and control forms of organization.

Horizontal Organization

In general, the various types of horizontal organization that have been proposed and tried during the last seventy-five or so years have been attempts to individualize instruction to match the individual differences of children. Many plans attempted to accomplish some degree of individualization within the graded school organization. In a sense many were compensatory in nature, since

they attempted to counteract the effects of gradedness. Other plans attempted to combine a modified graded (vertical) with a different kind of horizontal plan.

The most prevalent forms of horizontal organization have probably been those of "homogeneous grouping"—a term that covers a great variety of plans. *The variety is so great that the term homogeneous grouping has little meaning beyond indicating a belief that grouping on the basis of similarity of some human characteristic will enhance instructional effectiveness.* The bases on which groupings have been made have included mental and physical abilities, scholastic achievement, creative potential, abilities in reading and arithmetic, sex, race, interest, and combinations of these. *About the only aspect of homogeneous grouping on which there is much general agreement is that grouping on the basis of a single trait or ability is not educationally defensible. There is little agreement as to what, if any, combination of traits and abilities* **is** *defensible.* Some educators oppose the whole concept on the basis that it is inherently undemocratic in nature.[59] Research evidence is inconclusive, but in spite of the lack of agreement and clear-cut research support, it is probable that most teachers, if they are not assigned groups of children homogeneously clustered, divide the pupils into groups for instruction in at least one subject—usually reading or arithmetic. Insofar as such grouping represents attempts at individualization, it is difficult to condemn, but insofar as such grouping represents only a convenient means of controlling a class group, it is difficult to support. At best there is the ever-present danger that teachers will believe that the children grouped together really *are* homogeneous.

Departmentalization represents another relatively prevalent form of horizontal organization, but, as with nongradedness and homogeneous grouping, the term has such a variety of meanings in actual practice that it is difficult to assess. Patterns of departmentalization in the elementary school range from a type similar to that in secondary schools (where each teacher is responsible for teaching a single subject to different groups of pupils) to teachers trading groups in order to teach their favorite subjects or each teacher being responsible for a combination of subjects (sometimes closely related to each other, sometimes not).[60] With such diversity it is difficult to draw the line between departmentalization and modified self-contained classrooms (the majority of elementary school classrooms), which include some specialist teachers (art, music, physical education, science, foreign language, economics, and so on).

A recent survey of elementary school principals reveals that only 19 percent have had experience with departmentalization in the primary grades but that almost 55 percent have had experience with departmentalized upper grades. Of those with such experience, only about one fifth felt sure of its value in the primary grades; in contrast, two thirds believed it to be of value in the upper grades.[61]

Research on the relative effectiveness of departmentalization is, again, very inconclusive; that is, evidence supporting departmentalization is balanced by that not supporting it.[62] This inconclusiveness is probably attributable to inadequate controls of the many phenomenalistic variables involved. *The overall trend in the broad area encompassed by the term departmentalization seems to be in the direction of greater specialization in both training and performance of teachers.* **Such specialization will undoubtedly be accompanied by some increase in departmentalized experiences of pupils, but probably much less than teacher specialization might indicate. The difference will be due primarily to improved methods of integrating the pupils' educational experiences through team teaching and programmed and computer-assisted instruction.**

Team teaching represents still another innovation in grouping children with teachers, and the label covers so many different patterns that it is not easy to assess this practice. Ranging from (1) carefully organized teams of teachers, assistants, and aides, each with freedom of utilizing its special talents and pooling its knowledge of pupils and pedagogy, to (2) exchanging groups for an instructional period to teach a favorite subject or (3) using the label with traditional practices, "team teaching" as a label has gained more rapidly in popularity among educators than it has as a practice. About 22 percent of elementary school principals in a recent survey had had experience with team teaching in the primary grades and about 29 percent in the upper grades. Of those, about one half believed it to be very valuable in the primary grades, and about 60 percent felt similarly about it for the upper grades.[63]

Research concerning the effectiveness of team teaching has been spotty and inconclusive in terms of pupil achievement,[64] but, in general, teachers who have tried it like it. *Both pupils and their parents, however, seem somewhat less enthusiastic and are apparently able to take it or leave it. Theoretically, team teaching offers several advantages: (1) several heads are better than one (although too many cooks spoil the broth); (2) each teacher can utilize her*

special strengths (assuming, of course, that she **has** *some special strengths and that these strengths do not duplicate those of another team member); (3) each pupil receives the combined attention of a team of experts (or is completely ignored because each member assumes that another is responsible); (4) a team approach should result in improved correlation and integration of subject matter (it has been conjectured that the camel is a horse put together by a committee); and (5) recognition can be given outstanding teachers through hierarchical organization of teams with team leaders, master teachers, helping teachers, and teaching aides (perhaps the problems of valid, reliable teacher evaluation will be solved to pave the way for merit pay).*

The most carefully contrived models of team teaching have utilized a mixed-group-size pattern of organizing pupils. Some things, it is claimed, are best presented to large groups, some to small groups, and some to individual pupils through independent or semi-independent study. Although such grouping patterns do break the old, unimaginative pattern, they too can become restrictive unless very flexible scheduling of individual pupils is possible. While it may be true that some things can most effectively be presented to large groups, it is seldom true that all children need or are ready for large-group presentations at the same time as their classmates.

Team teaching, team administration, and team learning have distinct and promising potential benefits to offer, but all are subject to the crippling effects of personnel clashes because of conflicting personalities, philosophies, and ego-building maneuvers.

It seems relatively certain that professional personnel will, in the future, increasingly engage in cooperative, highly coordinated patterns of educational activity, but it is also likely that there will be deliberate limits established to protect the individuality, creativity, and personal integrity of teachers. Children deserve no less.

Each of the three basic types of vertical organization lends itself to almost any of the horizontal types or to combinations of horizontal types. Some types, such as nongrading (continuous progress), seem to be particularly enhanced by team teaching, especially if scheduling is really individual and flexible. Team teaching can, in turn, be enhanced by some teacher specialization (a type of departmentalization) if the pupil's experiences are integrated. The value of homogeneous grouping for nongrading will probably depend on the degree of flexibility achieved in individual scheduling.

Although in the past there have been several noteworthy plans for incorporating the continuous-progress vertical form of organization and a variety of combinations of horizontal forms plus independent learning (Winnetka and Dalton plans), most have been ahead of their times and have not been widely adopted. *A more recent plan incorporating both vertical and horizontal organizational features has been developed by Stoddard. Called the Dual Progress Plan,[66] it provides for two basic curriculum areas, "cultural imperatives" (language arts and social studies as a core program) within a graded structure and "cultural electives" (mathematics, science, art, and music on a departmentalized basis) in a nongraded program.* The Dual Progress Plan has received little evaluation, and so little research has been concerned with it that there is no evidence to support or refute its effectiveness. Unfortunately, it received some very biased public criticism[66] before it was well established, and it seems to have made little impact as yet on public education; nor is it likely to do so in the future if continuous progress and integrated learning can be generally achieved. If not, however, the Dual Progress Plan may serve as a desirable way of filling the transitional gap that would be inevitable.

Supervision in Elementary Education

Supervision may be defined as the process of making "significant improvements in instruction through others."[67] In most tables of educational organization, supervision is considered a staff function as compared to administration, a line function. Thus, at the school district central office level, there is frequently a department of supervision in larger school systems, or the responsibility for supervision may be within the jurisdiction of a curriculum director or director of instruction. In the past, and probably still in many districts, there has been or is available (more or less) to elementary school teachers a general elementary school supervisor, who usually serves several schools. Increasingly, special-subject and special-service supervisors are becoming available. This trend is in keeping with the increasing specialization of teachers and with expanded and more specialized knowledge concerning such service areas as social work, speech therapy, remedial reading, counseling and guidance, and subject area.

In addition to, but perhaps most commonly in place of, central office supervisors, the elementary school principal has, for many years, desired and has been expected to provide instructional supervision. As the concept of supervision changed from authority-based direction to supportive consultation and facilitation and as central office supervisors appeared in greater numbers, the elementary school

principal faced the problem of modifying his own supervisory activities and of utilizing effectively the central office supervisors available to his faculty. This has not always been an easy task, since some supervisors were required or preferred to give their allegiance to the central office—sometimes almost completely ignoring the elementary school principal or deliberately circumventing his position. Such tactics, however, have rarely been successful for very long because of the rather simple fact that the principal has had the power of his role as the line officer. A large part of the principal's influence on school climate stems from his power to put ideas, proposals, and programs into action. With the advantages of daily contacts with the teachers, pupils, and parents of his school and a reasonable amount of skill in human relations, the principal has maintained a strong hand in the area of supervision.

A third and gradually growing type of supervision is that of the teacher-leader of a teaching team, who to be most effective must be allowed a relatively large amount of freedom to guide the instructional improvement of the team. For the principal who has supervised almost entirely on an individual-teacher rather than on a group basis, this means revising his role with new and different skills.

Both the special-subject supervisors from the central office and the teacher-leader supervisors are increasing in number. The principal's traditional roles of supervision and teacher-rating have, in many cases, been contradictory and self-cancelling. Teachers are becoming more and more specialized in their knowledge and skills. Instructional materials, equipment, and technology are becoming more complex. Teacher militancy is creating new barriers between teachers and the principal. For these reasons, and also because of the need and speed of innovations in education and decision-making, it has been suggested that the elementary school principal completely revise his concept of his supervision functions.

At present there are two rather distinct schools of thought concerning what the elementary school principal's role, if any, should be in supervision. As is so often the case with controversy, opposing factions do not disagree on the general goal, which for supervision is improving instruction, but rather on means, that is, the type of tasks the principal should undertake as his responsibility in attaining the goal. The sources of this division of thought are not difficult to understand. One belief is based on the goal that principals have strived to attain for many years—being directly and completely involved in the leadership functions of improving instruction. Traditionally, supervision has been interpreted in many ways, gradually shifting from authoritarian direction to demonstration teaching to climate development and facilitation through a variety of resources.

Although the elementary school principal has long struggled to shake the role of head teacher, traditionally he has frequently justified his role and talent as supervisor by his self-concept as "superteacher," a concept generally supported by selection processes, the principal-preparation program, and state certification requirements.[69] Because of his effort and the lack of central office supervisors, the elementary school principal has gained considerable responsibility, as is evidenced by the recent survey of elementary school principals. Of the responding principals, 75 percent claimed *primary* responsibility for supervision, and only about 6 percent believed that they had *little* responsibility.[69] Slightly more than half declared their role in shaping curriculum to be that of working with teachers to modify and adapt the general district plans in terms of the needs of a specific school.[70] Slightly more than half reported that the selection of instructional materials is accomplished cooperatively by faculty and principal, with 38 percent reporting that school-district committees were responsible for selection.[71] About half of the responding principals reported that the determination of specific teaching methods is accomplished in large part by each teacher, but with their knowledge and advice. About 16 percent reported that they determine methods, while an equal percentage reported that methods are determined by a group comprised of teachers and principals.[72] Two thirds of the principals reported that pupil placement is determined by a process involving pupils, parents, teachers, and the principal within the policy framework of the district and school. This represents a decline since 1958 of between 6 to 10 percent reporting this process. The difference seems to indicate a slight trend toward pupil placement in accordance with required system-wide policy.[73]

Of the various contributions principals make to the improvement of instruction in their schools, slightly more than half believed their most effective contribution to be the creation of a climate in which teachers are expected to experiment and share ideas. About 20 percent believed it to be helping individual teachers with problems in their classrooms. By comparison with the 1958 survey, "*There appears to be less faith today in the supervisory effectiveness of organizing committees to study and report on instructional problems*" and less confidence in helping the individual

teacher to study and act on his classroom problems."[74]

Principals reported a variety of sources of ideas for recent innovations, the most common of which were local workshops (24 percent), professional reading (19 percent), and other principals and teachers (16 percent). In general, the major shifts that have taken place during the last ten years reflect an "increased dependence upon professional reading and college courses."[75] The approaches most frequently reported for trying out new ideas are ones involving the entire school faculty and the principal working together (62 percent) and working with individual teachers (30 percent). A major reversal of approaches apparently has occurred since 1958, when 80 percent reported working with individual teachers and 13 percent worked as a part of the entire school faculty.[76]

There are definite indications in practice of a trend away from the principal's concept of his role as "superteacher" in supervision, and recent research has produced little evidence to support the "superteacher" role. *In fact, evidence has been accumulating to the effect that length of teaching experiences and administrative effectiveness are negatively related.*[77]

The current school of thought, which does not agree with the concept of the principal as a "superteacher"-supervisor, includes some who believe that the principal should not engage in supervision at all.

> In addition to improving the competencies of teachers, it is critical to focus and combine these and other resources to achieve some set of objectives. The latter function I shall identify here as *strategic coordination*: rationally and artfully combining the discrete human and material components of a school and its community to form a functioning whole, an educational instrument for a particular group of students at a particular juncture in time.
>
> . . . Schools approaching the Catfish Corners type will remain with us for some time. . . . But little by little the idea will be abandoned that the principal should concentrate on instructional supervision. Eventually he will be free—indeed, expected—to exhibit his talents chiefly by creating and maintaining, through continuous analysis and revision, the best school program that is possible in his community for the students his school must serve.[78]

Recent statements and recommendations by others see a role in the future that is considerably different from that of the "superteacher" concept.[79] They see the principal's role as one primarily of coordination, facilitation, motivation, reconciliation, mediation, and cooperation involving all factors pertinent to effective instruction. Such a role calls for skill in human relations, systems analysis, decision-making, and communication in addition to a knowledge of educational technology, organizations, child growth and development, the psychophenomenology of learning, and educational sociology. **The procedures of supervision that entail depth of knowledge in a specific service or subject area, the specific teaching techniques and strategies for a particular group with their unique needs, the demonstration teaching, and the exploration with individual teachers of their individual classroom problems according to this school of thought become increasingly the responsibility of the special-subject/special-service supervisors, the team-teaching leaders, and the technicians for the technological hardware of education.**

An analysis of trends indicates that the rapid changes all about the principal, the contradiction between his teacher-rating and teacher-supervision functions, the specialization of teachers, teaming of teachers, the militant power of teachers to help to determine curriculum and organization, the increasing complexity of educational technology, and the growing numbers of para-professionals all make virtually impossible the "superteacher" mode of supervision in the future.

Summary. In summary it might be useful to list some trends and some facts that derive from the interrelationships of the topics and subtopics discussed to this point. For, in spite of the separation of the subtopics in this paper and in other writing, they—and much much more—are all of one piece in a child's life.

(1) First, it needs to be emphasized that proper perspective is essential to the meaningfulness of any discussion of administration, organization, and supervision. Without accepting the primacy of the goal of helping children to live rich, full, self-fulfilled, purposeful, and happy lives with ability to communicate, create, and love and with respect and value for the human individual and human differences, administration has no purpose, organization serves no end, and supervision becomes a ridiculous game of Charades.

(2) The downtrodden, the slighted, the eager, the hopeful, the anxious, the weak, and the ignorant are in line at public education's door. Never before has so much been hoped, expected, and demanded of public education, and there will be no turning the hopeful away before they have had their day. Perhaps none of them has a right to expect, to demand, what education may not yet be able to give. But they will not be satisfied until they have received their

share of the good life, the decent life, or until they have exhausted their share of the right to be wrong.

(3) The world promises to be more than we have ever dreamed or feared, and time-tested ways and familiar guideposts will no longer serve. New guides must be found in the scientific ways of controlling science, in the knowledge of the nature of knowledge, and in the humanization of humanity.

(4) Small school districts are consolidating for efficiency, and extremely large ones are decentralizing for basically the same reason.

(5) A variety of shapes, sizes, and partners will characterize the increasing experimentation in school district organizations for the immediate future. This could result in a much better overall articulation of effective educational experiences for more children than ever before.

(6) The traditional concept of local control and funding is fading fast. Geographical and political boundaries and sacred sources of funding are becoming less important than the educational welfare of all children.

(7) In some areas the neighborhood and small community are disappearing, particularly in educational organization. In other areas, especially those which comprise minority segments of society, education is being directed to unique local needs.

(8) Teachers are no longer willing to submit patiently to increasing pressures from all sides. Threatened by the influx of a hoard of paraprofessionals and parents, they have sought and attained rights of negotiating the provisions for what they have always ultimately been responsible—instruction, its organization, processes, and content.

(9) Administration has been no longer able to ignore the inevitable: the imperatives of goal-defining, of decision-making, of facing squarely the purposes of its role. The very flood of innovations and pressures gives administration no alternative but to retool, to reorganize with the most modern of methods, and to seek specialized counsel of many sorts.

(10) Elementary school principals can no longer expect to supervise on the basis of their own teaching experience and talents.

(11) The long fruitless struggle of trying to put a "Tareyton filter on another cigarette," which has characterized the attempts to solve with horizontal organizational plans the vertical problems of gradedness—the individualization of instruction, will undoubtedly continue, but, as the meaning and value of continuous progress is recognized, a basic breakthrough may occur.

(12) Teachers will become more specialized, but at the same time more broadly "educated"; children's educational experiences will become more integrated, but with greater sophistication in each discipline. Above all, children will learn how to learn—a skill they will need throughout life. All this will come to pass, but not right away. It is occurring in some places already; it will be innovative in some schools twenty years hence.

(13) More and more frequently all aspects of education will be evaluated by the criterion of pupil performance rather than by the criteria of provisions for teaching, learning, administration, supervision, and so forth. But to be successful, new methods, new concepts, and new value patterns must be discovered or devised.

(14) At the present time educational innovations are introduced by administrators,[40] primarily because of their authority to precipitate a decision. As teachers gain power and other segments of society press to be heard, the administrators will gain partners in innovating.

(15) Those responsible for administration, organization, and supervision have no valid purpose other than facilitating attainment of the basic goals of education; as facilitators they can make goal attainment by students easier, but they can never achieve the goals of education themselves. Only learners can do that—but effective teachers help.

Footnotes

[1] See **Roald F. Campbell, J. E. Corbally, Jr.,** and **J. A. Ramseyer,** *Introduction to Educational Administration* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1958), Ch. 3.

[2] For a report on public-opinion and status surveys, see **D. R. Reich,** "The Supreme Court and Public Policy: The School Prayer Cases," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 48 (Sept. 1966), 29-32.

[3] "The Great American Frustration," *Saturday Review,* 51 (13 July 1968), 13-16.

[4] "Estimates of School Statistics, 1967-68," *NEA Research Bulletin,* 46 (March 1968), 14, when compared to figures presented for 1954-55 in "School Statistics, 1964-65," *NEA Research Bulletin,* 43 (Feb. 1965), 3-8, reveal a decrease in total school districts of approximately 36,000, from about 58,000 to 21,704. An indication of the still-continuing nature of this trend is provided by the amounts of annual decrease in the last three years: 1964-65 to 1965-66, a decrease of 1,975; 1965-66 to 1966-67, a decrease of 4,021; 1966-67 to 1967-68, a decrease of 1,077. During the same period, pupil enrollment increased 1,543,880. These figures were obtained from the *NEA Research Bulletins* cited above plus Vol. 44 (Feb. 1966), 22. For a summary and review of 30 years of research, see **Charles F. Faber,** "The Size of a School District," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 48 (Sept. 1966), 33-35.

[5] See **Gerald W. Bolcourt,** "New Developments in Administration of Metropolitan Schools," in *The Schools and the Urban Crisis: A Book of Readings,* ed. August Kerber and Barbara Bommarito (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 322-26; "Schools Make News: More Big City Studies," *Saturday Review,* 51 (20 July 1968), 55; **Theodore L. Reller,** "A Comprehensive Program for the Preparation of Administrators," Ch. 7 in *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives,* ed. Jack A. Culbertson and Stephen P. Hencley (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration). See also the "Bundy Report," *Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City,* and **David Rogers,** "New York City Schools: A Sick Bureaucracy," *Saturday Review,* 51 (21 July 1968), 47-48, 59-61. For different viewpoints on decentralization, see "Position Paper" by Five-State Organizing Committee for Community Control at Harvard Conference on Educational Subsystems, pp. 450-51, and Sam and Vail Hamerman, eds., "A Single Unit Approach to Urban Problems," pp. 453-57, *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (April 1968).

[6] See **Warner Bloomberg, Jr.,** and **John Kincaid,** "Parent Participation: Practical Policy or Another Panacea?" *The Urban Review,* 2 (June 1968), 5-11; **Maxine Greene,** "Return to Community," *The Record,* 69 (Feb. 1968), 484-90; **Nat Hentoff,** "Making Public Schools Accountable: A Case Study of P.S. 201 in Harlem," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 48 (March 1967), 332-35. For a general discussion and proposal, see **F. M. Newmann** and **D. W. Oliver,** "Education and Community," *Harvard Educational Review,* 37 (Winter 1967), 61-106.

[7] For a general discussion and some specific case studies, see **Roald F. Campbell,** "Federal-State Educational Relations," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (Sept. 1967), 16-20; **Kenneth B. Clark,** "Alternative Public School Systems," *Harvard Educational Review,* 38 (Winter 1968), 100-113.

[8] For some examples see *The Alumni Eagle* (Chadron, Neb.: Chadron College Alumni Association, 1968) for a description of the arrangement for Chadron State College to assume management of the Crawford Public School System, Crawford, Nebraska, and **Paul Lauter,** "The Short, Happy Life of the Adams-Morgan Community School Project," *Harvard Educational Review,* 38 (Spring 1968), 235-62.

[9] See **Luvern L. Cunningham,** "Organization in Metropolitan Areas," pp. 91-122, and all of "Section V: Metropolitan Frontiers," pp. 319-83, in *Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education,* 67th Yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education, ed. Robert J. Havighurst (Chicago: NSSE, 1968).

[10] **Marvin C. Alkin,** "Revenues for Education in Metropolitan Areas," pp. 124-47, in *Metropolitanism: Its Challenge to Education.*

[11] "Keeping Abreast in Education: Education Park Idea Growing," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 48 (March 1967), 374; **S. P. Marland, Jr.,** "The Education Park Concept in Pittsburgh," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 48 (March 1967), 328-32; **David F. Bine, Max Wolff,** and **Lucile Lindberg,** "Opinions Differ: Educational Parks," *NEA Journal,* 57 (March 1968), 44-47.

[12] **Jean M. Flanigan,** "Is There a Taxpayers' Revolt?" *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (Oct. 1967), 88-91.

[13] "Keeping Abreast in Education: Silver Cloud, Dark Lining," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49

(March 1968), 413; "Schools Make News: The Poor Pay the Price," *Saturday Review*, 51 (21 July 1968), 54.

[14] **A. F. Brown** and **J. H. House,** "The Organizational Component in Education," *Review of Educational Research*, 37 (Oct. 1967), 399-416; **Roald F. Campbell,** "Is the School Superintendent Obsolete?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48 (Oct. 1966), 50-58; **Jack A. Culbertson** and **Stephen P. Hencley,** eds., *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives* (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962), esp. Chs. 3-7; **Donald A. Erickson,** "The School Administrator," *Review of Educational Research*, 37 (Oct. 1967), 417-32; **Allan R. Talbot,** "Needed: A New Breed of School Superintendents," *Harper's Magazine*, Feb. 1966, 81-87.

[15] **Brown** and **House,** "The Organizational Component in Education"; **Jack A. Culbertson,** "New Perspectives: Implications for Program Change," in *Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives*.

[16] American Association of School Administrators, *School Administrators View Professional Negotiation* (Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1965); **Charles F. Wilson,** "Whose Man Is the Superintendent?" pp. 156-57, and **Gene Geisert,** "Mr. Nobody," pp. 158-59, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48 (Dec. 1966)

[17] "Secession in Michigan," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48 (Feb. 1967), 300; **Myron Lieberman** and **M. H. Moscow,** *Collective Negotiations for Teachers* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966); **T. M. Stinnett, J. H. Kleinmann,** and **M. L. Ware,** *Professional Negotiations in Public Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1966).

[18] **A. Glovinsky** and **J. P. Johns,** "Paraprofessionals Are in Schools To Stay—True or False?" *Nation's Schools*, 82 (Aug. 1968), 24-25; "Teacher Aides in Public Schools," *NEA Research Bulletin*, 45 (May 1967), 57-59.

[19] **A. S. Kern,** "What Teacher Aides Can—and Cannot—Do," *Nation's Schools*, 82 (Aug. 1968), 23-25.

[20] "How the Profession Feels about Teacher Aides," pp. 16, 17, and "How Teacher Aides Feel about Their Jobs," pp. 17-19, *NEA Journal*, 56 (Nov. 1967).

[21] **Emery Stoops** and **R. E. Johnson,** *Elementary School Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 6.

[22] See the national surveys made by the Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, in 1948, 1958, and 1968.

[23] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study* (Washington, D. C.: Dept. of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1968), pp. 38-61.

[24] Ibid., p. 55.

[25] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

[26] Ibid., pp. 60-61.

[27] **Brown** and **House,** "The Organizational Component in Education"; see also **Robert Plaxton,** "Principal Personality and School Organizational Climate," *CSA Bulletin*, 4 (July 1965), 21-35.

[28] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study*.

[29] Ibid., pp. 56-57.

[30] "Specialists in Elementary Education," *Grade Teacher*, 85 (Feb. 1968), 100-103. (A survey of 65 "cutting-edge" school districts.)

[31] "Team Teaching," *NEA Research Bulletin*, 45 (Dec. 1967), 114-15.

[32] For discussion of specialization, see **William D. Hedges,** "Differentiated Teaching Responsibilities in the Elementary School," *The National Elementary Principal*, 48 (Sept. 1967), 48-54; **George G. Stoddard,** "Generalists and Specialists in the Elementary School," in *Crucial Issues in Education*, ed. Henry Ehlers and Gordon C. Lee, 3rd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

[33] See **Glovinsky** and **Johns,** "Paraprofessionals Are in Schools To Stay—True or False?" and "Teacher Aides in Public Schools."

[34] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study*, pp. 57-60.

[35] **James C. King,** "New Directions for Collective Negotiation," *The National Elementary Principal*, 47 (Sept. 1967), 43-47; **J. H. Langer,** "The Emerging Elementary Principalship in Michigan," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48 (Dec. 1966), 160-61; **Lieberman** and **Moscow,** *Collective Negotiations for Teachers*; **George B. Redfern,** "Negotiation Changes Principal-Teacher Relationships," *The National Elementary Principal*, 47 (April 1968), 20-25.

[36] This definition is loosely adapted from **S. B. Sarason,** *The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis* (Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co, 1967), and **P. M. Blau** and **W. R. Scott,** *Formal Organizations* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962).

[37] **Brown** and **House,** "The Organizational Component in Education."

[38] For rather comprehensive treatments, see **Stuart E. Dean,** *Elementary School Administration and Organization*, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 11 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960); "Elementary School Organization," *The National Elementary Principal*, 41 (Dec. 1961); **Maurie Hillson,** *Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization: Selected Readings* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965); **H. J. Otto** and **D. C. Sanders,** *Elementary School Organization and Administration*, 4th ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964); **D. C. Sanders,** "Patterns of Organization," *Elementary Education and the Academically Talented Pupil* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1961), pp. 68-85.

[39] "Graded Schools," in **Hillson,** *Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization*, pp. 2-5.

[40] **H. G. Shane,** "Grouping in the Elementary School," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 41 April 1960), 313-19.

[41] **John I. Goodlad** and **Kenneth Enage,** "Unscrambling the Vocabulary of School Organization," *NEA Journal*, 5 (Nov. 1962), 34-36.

[42] **J. E. Kittell,** "A Critical Review of the Conference on the Middle Shool," *SIRS* (Seattle: School Information ad Research Service, Intermediate District K, 1966-67), 15 (6 June 1967), 1-5.

[43] For overviews see **Maurita Jolson,** "School in the Middle," *Saturday Revie*, 45 (21 July 1964), 56-57; **J. E. Kittell,** Changing Patterns of Education: The 'Iddle School' Years," *The College of Eduteon Record (College of Education, University of Washington)*, 33 (March 1967):0-68; **Paul Woodring,** "The New Intermedte School," *Saturday Review*, 48 (Oct. 196, 77, 78. For arguments pro middle schoolssee **Neal C. Nickerson, Jr.,** *Junior High Sools Are on the Way Out* (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1966) for a scholarly argument con middleschools, see **Popper,** *The American Middleschool: An Organizational Analysis*.

[44] **Kittell,** "Changing Patterns of Education: The 'Middle School' Years."

[45] Ibid.

[46] "Keeping Abreast in Education: Trends in School Construction," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (June 1968), 620.

[47] These figures were gathered by a survey conducted by *Education News* and reported in *Phi Delta Kappan,* 50 (Sept. 1968), 63.

[48] For a succinct account and selected bibliography, see **Clifford D. Foster,** "Changing Patterns of Education: Early Childhood," *The College of Education Record* (College of Education, University of Washington), 33 (March 1967), 55-61.

[49] Ibid., p. 60.

[50] The Litchfield Park Plan as reported in *Education U.S.A.* and abridged in "Keeping Abreast in Education: School from Birth—or Before," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 50 (Sept. 1968), 66; see also "Ypsilanti's School for Babies," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (April 1968), 444.

[51] For the 1966-67 school year, only 148 of the nation's 11,970 public school systems with 300 or more pupils had nursery schools according to "Nursery School Education, 1966-67," *NEA Research Bulletin,* 46 (May 1968), 54-56.

[52] **B. H. Fleiss,** "The Continuity of Education, from Pre-Kindergarten to Primary," *Young Children,* 22 (Nov. 1966), 78-82.

[53] **Shane,** "Grouping in the Elementary School."

[54] See **Hillson,** pp. 295-96.

[55] For discussions of various aspects of nongraded elementary schools, see the November 1967 and January 1968 issues of *The National Elementary Principal,* Vol. 47, and **Hillson,** Part IV, "Nongrading"; **J. I. Goodlad** and **Robert H. Anderson,** *The Nongraded Elementary School,* rev. ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1963); **F. R. Dufay,** *Ungrading the Elementary School* (West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966).

[56] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study,* pp. 132-3.

[57] **William P. McLoughlin,** "The Phantom Nongraded School," *Phi Delta Kappan,* 49 (Jan. 1968), 248-50.

[58] Ibid. and **Hillson,** *Change and Innovation.*

[59] **Hillson,** Part II, "Ability, Partial Ability, and Homogeneous Grouping Plans," pp. 46-110.

[60] "Departmentalization in Elementary Schools," *NEA Research Bulletin,* 44 (Feb. 1968), 27-28.

[61] *The National Elementary Principal,* pp. 103-5.

[62] **Hillson,** Part III, "Departmentalized and Semi-Departmentalized Grouping Plans," pp. 111-62.

[63] *The National Elementary Principal,* pp. 105-6.

[64] **Hillson,** Part IV, "Team Teaching, Team Learning, Coordinate and Collaborative Teaching," pp. 163-243.

[65] **G. D. Stoddard,** "The Dual Progress Plan," *School and Society,* 86 (Oct. 1958), 351-52. See also **Hillson,** Part V, "Dual Progress and Multiage and Multigrade Grouping Plans," pp. 244-92.

[66] **Robert S. Fleming,** et al., "Reactions to the Dual Progress Plan," *Educational Leadership,* 18 (Nov. 1960), 92-95.

[67] **James Curtin,** *Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), p. 10.

[68] **W. E. Armstrong** and **T. M. Stinnett,** *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1957); **Luther E. Bradfield,** *Supervision for Modern Elementary Schools* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964), Ch. 1; **Curtin,** *Supervision in Today's Elementary Schools,* Ch. 10; **Paul J. Misner, F. W. Schneider,** and **L. G. Keith,** *Elementary School Administration* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1963), p. 196.

[69] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968: A Research Study,* pp. 78-79.

[70] Ibid., pp. 79-80.

[71] Ibid., pp. 80-82.

[72] Ibid., pp. 82-83.

[73] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[74] Ibid., pp. 84-86.

[75] Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[76] Ibid., pp. 88-89.

[77] **Donald A. Erickson,** "The School Administrator," *Review of Educational Research,* 37 (Oct. 1967), 417-32; for research reports see **Robert Dubreen** and **Neal Gross,** *The Role Behavior of School Principals,* U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research, Project No. 853, Final Report No. 3 (Cambridge: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, 1963); **Neal Gross** and **R. E. Herriott,** *Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965); **Edgar L. Morphet** and **William C. Schutz,** *Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Administrative Positions,* U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research, Project 1076 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).

[78] **D. A. Erickson,** "Changes in the Principalship: Cause for Jubilation or Despair?" *The National Elementary Principal,* 44 (April 1965); see also **John E. Dawson,** "New Approaches to Decision-Making: Implications for the Elementary School Principal," *The National Elementary Principal,* 47 (May 1968), 62-69.

[79] **D. A. Myers,** "The Principal as a Procedural Administrator," *The National Elementary Principal,* 47 (Feb. 1968), 24-29; **T. C. Wood,** "The Changing Role of the Teacher—How Does It Affect the Role of the Principal?" *The National Elementary Principal,* 47 (April 1968), 32-37; **Harold J. McNally,** "The American Principal Tomorrow," *The National Elementary Principal,* 47 (May 1968), 85-91.

[80] **W. S. Elsbree, H. J. McNally,** and **R. Wynn,** "A Look Ahead at School Administration," *The National Elementary Principal,* 46 (April 1967), 40-49.

5 Managing Change

Through this report, many tentative suggestions have been advanced as to how a broader rationale and a new curriculum base for FLES might be evolved. This process will be neither easy nor rapid. Curricular reform is a slow process, but the time between the FLES programs in existence today and the ones envisioned for the future can best be spent in careful and deliberate planning to avoid the charge that earlier FLES efforts had "unrealistic objectives."

The total movement toward the evolution of a broader rationale and a new curriculum base for FLES must involve professional organizations on national, regional, state, and local levels. Colleges and universities and school systems, too, will have to be participants in the endeavor. No single "ideal" plan will emerge, but tentative solutions, that is, working hypotheses, can be developed that will lead, ultimately, to the broader rationale and new curriculum base desired for FLES. The process proposed in this report does not begin by setting forth a new theoretical rationale for adaptation and implementation in the local situation; it assumes that the broader rationale and new curriculum base can result *only* after the local groups have explored all the possibilities.

The following areas have been identified for future study:

Research and Experimentation

It is extremely important that studies be conducted to determine the relationship of age and ability to achieve a near-native accent in a foreign language; the critical comparisons recommended should be among children younger than ten, a group in their mid-teens, and a college group. Comparable studies should also be made in the areas of vocabulary acquisition and grammar mastery.

There is a need to specify goals in the affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains. Foreign-language teachers must have their attention focused on the wider aspects of learning to discover more about the differences among learners and the variety of learning styles they employ. Work in these areas should precede further experimentation with teaching techniques and methods.

There is much concern today about the ways in which research studies are cited, evaluated, and used. There is a distinct need for more responsibility in the professional use of research and in the kinds of publicity and interpretations arising from some research studies. Foreign-language teachers must be prepared by their professional

organizations, their teacher-preparation programs, and their school systems to make intelligent use of both the research studies themselves and the articles published about such studies.

FLES and the Total Elementary Curriculum

If FLES is to be integrated horizontally into the elementary curriculum as well as vertically into the long language sequence, then foreign-language specialists must learn a good deal more about the elementary school. First, they must describe the entire elementary school population; then they should assess the needs of particular groups of children. Simultaneously with this assessment of the student population, there must be a determination of the existing philosophy of the elementary school as well as the trends emerging in other subject-matter areas and the "overlapping" areas of related teaching goals. However, caution must be exercised in this process. The total curricular pattern of any school is determined by the peculiar population of that school; the fact that two schools are in the same system does not mean that both schools have identical societal and student population requirements. The concern in the studies suggested here should not be with who will take charge, but with what the end product is to be. There are many ways in which foreign-language teachers may cooperate with language arts and social studies teachers—not necessarily by coming together in courses of instruction *per se*, but in terms of trying to evolve the common objectives these teachers have for the elementary schoolchild. These cooperative efforts should center on the definition of goals and the production of materials rather than on actual "merged" courses or class offerings.

Administrative Involvement

It is imperative that foreign-language specialists enlist administrative support *and leadership* in the process of instructional program development and goal definition. Ideally, all such activities should have administrative sponsorship. In many instances the task of program development and goal definition is not one for a single school system, but, rather, for groups of systems. Administrators' organizations on all levels—national, regional, state, and local—must be actively involved in this process. An integrated educational experience for the elementary child cannot emerge without this support.

Definition of FLES Objectives

The definition of realistic and achievable objectives for the FLES program emerges as the single most imperative need. The definition process must involve elementary educators other than the foreign-language staff.

If professional organizations are to attempt definitions of objectives on a national, state, or regional level, it seems vital that guidelines accompany these definitions to direct the local staff in the application, modification, and implementation of the objectives in a specific school or school system.

FLES teachers must define the goals they have at present before they can attempt to evolve goals with their elementary colleagues for future programs. A "self-definition" phase must be concurrent with attempts to involve administrators in leadership roles and efforts to study the total elementary curriculum.

Teaching Models

Existing teaching models should be studied and attempts should be made to develop and implement specific teaching designs for foreign languages. Models for mastery learning must be developed for use in conjunction with these projects. It would appear that such projects would necessitate the cooperative efforts of several school systems or continuing workshop series (such as utilized in the Nebraska Project English development) for the extended periods of time needed to make the plans that must precede the implementation of the teaching model in the classroom.

Incorporated into the attempt to develop and implement teaching models must be the definition of objectives, the sequencing of instruction, and the development of evaluative instruments before any attempt is made to initiate the program. School systems must explore the possibilities of funding, engaging consultant help, and providing released time so that this process may occur.

A Single-School Approach

A single school or program attempting to utilize this report in the improvement of its FLES offerings might begin by initiating dialogues with the appropriate groups of people for each area on the following topics:

1. What are the objectives of the FLES program as it now exists?
2. What are the needs of the student population we are trying to reach?
3. What is the overall school design and teaching philosophy?
4. What kinds of content and what instructional strategies are the other subject-matter areas employing in their efforts to fit into a total curriculum responsive to student needs?
5. What kinds of foreign-language learnings best relate to the student needs and/or complement and reinforce his other learnings?
6. What kind of foreign-language

program, incorporating the identified learnings, must be designed to be well integrated into the total curriculum?

At this stage, then, the foreign-language staff with other elementary educators can begin to specify the objectives for the FLES program. Ideally, simultaneous with the definition of objectives for each unit, there should be the development of testing instruments and the determination of sequencing. Then and only then should the "new" FLES be tried in the classroom and, when it is tried, the teaching methods should be evaluated in terms of their efficiency in helping the students to achieve the course objectives. This process is not to be accomplished in weeks or months—it is a project for long-term development.

The sessions of the ILP-ACTFL National Invitational Work Conference emphasized the need for greater knowledge of the total educational program offered by a school or school system, the need to know the workings of the school system, and the imperative requirement to learn more about the child to whom the educational offerings are being directed if change is to be managed.

Appendix

New Dimensions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School

Invitational Working Conference
8-9 November 1968
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Background Notes

The genesis of this Conference is noteworthy because it was made possible through the generous, continued funding of ILP by the Ford Foundation and because it was planned and nurtured by the ILP staff members who were determined to meet their commitment to the Ford Foundation. For three long years the ILP worked to bring about this meeting, the 1968 ILP-ACTFL National Invitational Conference—"New Dimensions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School."

George Smith, the Director of ILP in 1965, and Wahneta Mullen, the Indiana State Supervisor of Foreign Languages, had a series of discussions that led to the notion that a Midwest FLES Conference was needed as a device for re-examining the place of FLES in the curriculum. By the fall of 1966, Clemens Hallman had become Director of ILP and Virginia Garibaldi Allen had joined the ILP staff as a FLES Consultant; they were joined by Elizabeth Ratté of Purdue University in the continuing discussions concerning the future of FLES. They agreed that the *raison d'être* of most FLES programs was that of a downward extension of a highly specialized discipline-sequence; that is, FLES had evolved into nothing more than preparation of the child for the secondary-school foreign-language program. The broader objectives of developing cultural and linguistic understandings were generally being ignored. They asked themselves whether it was possible to make FLES relevant to the child's life while he was in elementary school—not at some far distant date. They concluded that FLES would become a permanent part of elementary school programs only if it proved its worth as a part of the total elementary curriculum; it was decided that ILP should sponsor a conference to explore and refine this hypothesis.

Virginia Allen consulted people in language arts, social studies, and elementary curriculum design to explore the possible potential relationship of foreign-language study to their areas of concern. They were asked to react to the ILP staff hypothesis on the place of FLES in the elementary school and the plans to hold a conference. All those contacted during a period of several months felt that ILP should sponsor the conference to explore the development of a new rationale for FLES.

An Indiana Conference Planning Committee was then formed, composed of: Ruth Strickland, Research Professor of Education (Language Arts), Indiana University; Gerald W. Marker, School Coordinator of Social Studies, Indiana University; Norman T. Pratt, Chairman, Department of Classical Languages and Literatures, Indiana University, and Representative to the ILP Advisory Committee; Elizabeth Ratté, Purdue University; Virginia G. Allen, ILP FLES Consultant; and Clemens Hallman, Director of ILP. This group determined that representatives of several disciplines should be invited to prepare position papers for a conference that would be exploratory and would lead to several follow-up activities. It became apparent to the group at this point in its planning that the effectiveness of the ILP effort would be greatly enhanced if it assumed national rather than just regional scope; the committee recommended that joint sponsorship for the effort be sought from ACTFL.

In December of 1967, M. Phillip Leamon, Interim Director of ILP, convened an Ad Hoc Committee to arrange joint ILP-ACTFL sponsorship of a national conference on FLES. In addition to Mr. Leamon, the Committee included George E. Smith, former Director of ILP; Jermaine Arendt, Foreign Language Consultant for the Minneapolis Public Schools; Lester McKim, Foreign Language Coordinator for the Bellevue (Washington) Public Schools; F. André Paquette, Executive Secretary of ACTFL; Lorraine A. Strasheim, School Consultant in Foreign Languages to the ILP; and Virginia G. Allen, FLES Specialist for the Rocky River (Ohio) Public Schools.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed with the earlier Indiana Conference Planning Committee that the conference should be organized around position papers prepared by elementary school educators representing several disciplines other than foreign languages and papers on curriculum and administration. In preparation for the conference, one scholar in the foreign language field—a person involved in some aspect of foreign-language education—and one FLES practitioner would be invited to react to each position paper.

The early part of 1968 was devoted to the detailed planning for the conference, commissioning of papers and reactions, and ILP-ACTFL coordination. Officers of ACTFL and ILP staff members then issued invitations to the conference, which was held in Minneapolis, Minnesota, on 8-9 November 1968.

Program

Lorraine A. Strasheim, Presiding

Friday 9:00-10:30

Trends in Elementary School Social Studies

Everett T. Keach, Jr., Professor of Social Science Education, Research and Development Center, University of Georgia

Scholar-Sympathizer
Sister Ruth Adelaide, Chairman, Modern Foreign Language Department, College of Mount Saint Joseph-on-the-Ohio

Practitioner
Gladys Lipton, Assistant Director of Foreign Languages, New York City Board of Education

Friday 11:00-12:30

Trends in Elementary School Language Arts

Ruth Strickland, Research Professor of Education, Indiana University

Scholar-Sympathizer
Virginia Garibaldi Allen, ACTFL FLES Committee and former FLES Consultant to the Indiana Language Program

Practitioner
Virginia Gramer, Elementary School Foreign-Language Supervisor, Public Schools, Hinsdale, Illinois

Friday 2:00-3:30

The Emerging Elementary School as a Setting for Foreign-Language Instruction

Bruce R. Joyce
Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

Scholar-Sympathizer
Violet Bergquist, Chairman, Spanish Teacher Education, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Practitioner
Robert Brooks, President, Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association, and Elementary School Classroom Teacher Cleveland, Ohio

Friday 4:00-5:30

Psychological and Educational Considerations in Early Language Learning

S. Jay Samuels
Professor of Educational Psychology and Member, Center for Research in Human Learning, University of Minnesota

Scholar-Sympathizer
Mildred Donoghue, Professor of Elementary and Secondary Education, California State College at Fullerton

Practitioner
Edward H. Bourque, Curriculum Consultant for Foreign Languages, Fairfield, Connecticut

Saturday 9:00-10:30

Goals and Trends of Administration, Organization, and Supervision in Elementary Education

Jack E. Kithell
Professor of Education, University of Washington, and Member, Tri-University Project, University of Nebraska

Scholar-Sympathizer
Frank Otto, Professor of Foreign Language Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus

Practitioner
Ralph W. Bassett, Foreign Language Consultant, Public Schools, Portland, Oregon

Saturday 11:00-12:30

New Dimensions and New Directions: Plan of Action

Emma M. Birkmaier
Professor of Education, University of Minnesota

Participants

Edward Allen
The Ohio State University

Virginia Garibaldi Allen
Columbus, Ohio

Jermaine D. Arendt
Minneapolis (Minnesota) Public Schools

Philip Arsenault
Montgomery County (Maryland) Public Schools

Nancy H. Balaban
University of Minnesota

Ralph W. Bassett
Portland (Oregon) Public Schools

Violet Bergquist
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Emma M. Birkmaier
1968 President, ACTFL
University of Minnesota

Robert L. Black
University of Minnesota

Mary Borra
Warwick (Rhode Island) Public Schools

Edward H. Bourque
Fairfield (Connecticut) Public Schools

Robert Brooks
Cleveland (Ohio) Public Schools

Thomas G. Bruni
Allentown (Pennsylvania) Public Schools

Marilyn J. Cogan
Ann Arbor (Michigan) Public Schools

Mary Collins
Freeport (Illinois) School District

Margaret Courant
Minneapolis (Minnesota) Public Schools

Louise Couture
Birmingham (Michigan) Public Schools

David M. Crossman
University of Pittsburgh
Representing: Department of Educational Technology

Eugene K. Dawson
Cleveland (Ohio) Board of Education

Hans W. Deeken
Executive Secretary
American Association of Teachers of German

Yvonne de Wright
Georgia State Department of Education

Mildred Donoghue
California State College at Fullerton

Naida M. Dostal
Detroit (Michigan) Public Schools

Mary DuFort
Alameda County (California) Schools

Dorothy Duhon
Colorado Department of Education

Roland Durette
Wisconsin State University at Whitewater

Rita Ebner
University of Minnesota

Karl-Heinz W. Evers
University of Minnesota

Peercy Fearing
Minnesota State Department of Education

Hildred Fitz
Kansas City (Missouri) Public Schools

Gerald R. Fortier
Springfield (Massachusetts) Public Schools

June Gibson
Office of the Indiana State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Virginia Gramer
Hinsdale (Illinois) Public Schools

Shirley Greenwood
Alexandria (Virginia) Public Schools

Robert O. Hall
National Instructional Television Center, Indiana University

Patricia Hammond
Oklahoma State Department of Education

Howard Hathaway
Upper Midwest Council for School Television (St. Paul, Minnesota)

Allen E. Hibbard
White Bear Lake (Minnesota) Public Schools

Charles J. James
University of Minnesota

Albert W. JeKenta
Beverly Hills (California) Unified School District

Angeline G. Jones
Rochester (New York) Public Schools

Helen Jorstad
Northfield (Minnesota) Public Schools

Bruce R. Joyce
Teachers College, Columbia University

Everett T. Keach, Jr.
University of Georgia

Elizabeth Keesee
USOE, Washington, D.C.

Jack E. Kittell
University of Washington

John F. Kunkle
Shaker Heights (Ohio) City Schools

Helen Kwapil
Seattle (Washington) Public Schools

Judith LeBovit
Washington, D.C., Public Schools
Representing: The American Classical League

Gladys Lipton
New York City Board of Education

Dominick R. Lozito
Wethersfield (Connecticut) School Department

Vernon Mauritsen
Concordia (Minnesota) College Language Camps

Lester W. McKim
Bellevue (Washington) Public Schools

Frank W. Medley
Indiana State University

Mathilde E. Meyer
Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania) Public Schools

Helen B. Miller
Indiana Language Program, Indiana University

Gertrude Moskowitz
Temple University
Representing: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Preparation

Frederick L. Oliver
Minneapolis (Minnesota) Public Schools

Hedi Oplesch
Robbinsdale (Minnesota) Public Schools

Frank Otto
The Ohio State University

Genevieve Overman
Denver (Colorado) Public Schools

F. André Paquette
Executive Secretary, ACTFL

Carol Anne Pesola
St. Olaf's College (Minnesota)

Mary Lee Poindexter
Fort Worth (Texas) Public Schools
Representing: Association for Childhood Education International

Elizabeth H. Ratté
Boston University

Rae S. Rettig
East Baton Rouge (Louisiana) Parish Schools

Donald C. Ryberg
Marshall-University High School (Minneapolis, Minnesota)

S. Jay Samuels
University of Minnesota

Donald L. Sandberg
National Instructional Television Center, Indiana University

Robert P. Serafino
New Haven (Connecticut) Public Schools

Sister Ruth Adelaide
College of Mount Saint Joseph-on-the-Ohio

Anne Slack
Modern Language Project (Marblehead, Massachusetts)

Lorraine A. Strasheim
Director, Indiana Language Program, Indiana University

Ruth Strickland
Indiana University

Barbara Swanson
University of Minnesota

Isis Tuel
Oklahoma City (Oklahoma) Board of Education

Joseph M. Vocolo
Buffalo (New York) Public Schools

Millard T. Wolfram
Bloomington (Minnesota) Public Schools